DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 277 862 CE 046 104

TITLE	New GI Bill and H.R. 3747, Veterans' Education Amendments of 1986. Hearing before the Subcommittee on Education, Training, and Employment of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. House of Representatives, Ninety-Ninth Congress, Second Session.
INSTITUTION	Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. House Committee on Veterans' Affairs.
PUB DATE	27 May 86
NOTE	82p.; Serial No. 99-53. Parts of this document contain small, light type.
AVAILABLE FROM	Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402.
PUB TYPE	Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090) -- Viewpoints (120)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adult Education; Educational Legislation; Federal Aid; *Federal Legislation; Hearings; Higher Education; Military Personnel; Postsecondary Education; *Student Financial Aid; Training Allowances; Veterans; *Veterans Education
IDENTIFIERS	Congress 99th; *GI Bill 1984; *Veterans Education Amendments 1986

ABSTRACT

In this congressional hearing on the Veterans' Education Amendments of 1986 and the New GI Bill, focus is on the testimony of those who will be most directly affected by its provisions--military recruiters, new recruits, senior noncommissioned officers, and leaders of National Guard and Reserve components. Testimony includes statements and prepared statements of individuals representing the U.S. Army, U.S. Air Force, Air National Guard, Army National Guard, U.S. Air Force Reserves, Colorado National Guard, U.S. Army Reserves, and South Dakota National Guard, as well as representatives in Congress. Appendixes include biographical sketches for a number of the witnesses and written committee questions and their responses. (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED277862

NEW GI BILL AND H.R. 3747, VETERANS' EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1986

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON
EDUCATION, TRAINING, AND EMPLOYMENT

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NINETY-NINTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

MAY 27, 1986

Printed for the use of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs

Serial No. 99-53

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

CE046104

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
62-067 O WASHINGTON : 1986

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office
U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

G.V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY, Mississippi, *Chairman*

DON EDWARDS, California
BOB EDGAR, Pennsylvania
DOUGLAS APPLEGATE, Ohio
RICHARD C. SHELBY, Alabama
DAN MICA, Florida
THOMAS A. DASCHLE, South Dakota
WAYNE DOWDY, Mississippi
LANE EVANS, Illinois
MARCY KAPTUR, Ohio
TIMOTHY J. PENNY, Minnesota
HARLEY O. STAGGERS, JR., West Virginia
J. ROY ROWLAND, Georgia
JOHN BRYANT, Texas
JAMES J. FLORIO, New Jersey
KENNETH J. GRAY, Illinois
PAUL E. KANJORSKI, Pennsylvania
TOMMY F. ROBINSON, Arkansas
FRANK McCLOSKEY, Indiana
JOHN PAUL HAMMERSCHMIDT, Arkansas
CHALMERS P. WYLIE, Ohio
ELWOOD HILLIS, Indiana
GERALD B.H. SOLOMON, New York
BOB McEWEN, Ohio
CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, New Jersey
DAN BURTON, Indiana
DON SUNDQUIST, Tennessee
MICHAEL BILIRAKIS, Florida
NANCY LEE JOHNSON, Connecticut
GUY V. MOLINARI, New York
THOMAS RIDGE, Pennsylvania
WILLIAM M. HENDON, North Carolina
JOHN G. ROWLAND, Connecticut

MACK G. FLEMING, *Chief Counsel and Staff Director*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, TRAINING, AND EMPLOYMENT

THOMAS A. DASCHLE, South Dakota, *Chairman*

LANE EVANS, Illinois
MARCY KAPTUR, Ohio
JOHN BRYANT, Texas
JAMES J. FLORIO, New Jersey
KENNETH J. GRAY, Illinois
BOB McEWEN, Ohio
CHALMERS P. WYLIE, Ohio
GERALD B.H. SOLOMON, New York
WILLIAM M. HENDON, North Carolina

CONTENTS

MAY 27, 1986

Page

New GI Bill and H.R. 3747, Veterans' Education Amendments of 1986 1

OPENING STATEMENT

Chairman Daschle 1

WITNESSES

Battey, Col. Bruce, Director of Education Policy, U.S. Army 16
Carter, Pvt. Earl, U.S. Army 39
Cathey, M. Sgt. Dwayne, U.S. Air Force 30
Coleman, Airman Marie A., U.S. Air Force 37
Cramer, T. Sgt. Cindy, Air National Guard 30
Crow, M. Sgt. Vernon K 42
Douglas, S.M. Sgt. Jeanie V., U.S. Air Force Reserves 32
France, Maj. Gen. John L, Adjutant General of the Colorado National Guard 20
Hand, Sfc. John Byron, U.S. Army Reserves 31
Hurd, Sfc. Norman Herbert, Jr., U.S. Army 29
Koski, Airman Lynette M., U.S. Air Force 36
Kramer, Hon. Ken, a Representative in Congress from the State of Colorado 8
Noe, M. Sgt. Philip, U.S. Air Force 42
Pollard, Pvt. Wallace, U.S. Army 40
Portman, Sfc. Paul Jean, Jr., U.S. Army 30
Schroeder, Hon. Patricia, a Representative in Congress from the State of Colorado 2
Prepared statement of Hon. Patricia Shroeder 49
Ulrich, C.M. Sgt. Gurney, Air National Guard 44
Wilkerson, Sfc. Claude, U.S. Army 42
Williamson, Maj. Gen. Ronald, Adjutant General of the South Dakota National Guard 22
Prepared statement of Maj. Gen. Ronald Williamson 53
Wirth, Hon. Timothy, a Representative in Congress from the State of Colorado 5
Prepared statement of Hon. Timothy Wirth 51

MATERIALS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

Statements:
Killey, Col. Philip G., Commander, South Dakota Army National Guard 56
Schaefer, Hon. Dan, a Representative in Congress from the State of Colorado 58

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES

Carter, Pvt. Earl, U.S. Army 59
Cathey, M. Sgt. Dwayne, U.S. Air Force 60
Coleman, Airman Marie A., U.S. Air Force 61
Cramer, T. Sgt. Cindy, Air National Guard 62
Crow, M. Sgt. Vernon K 63
Douglas, S.M. Sgt. Jeanie V., Air Force Reserve 64
Hand, Sfc. John Byron, U.S. Army Reserve 65
Hurd, Sfc. Norman Herbert, Jr., U.S. Army 66
Koski, Airman Lynette M., U.S. Air Force 67

Page

Noe, M. Sgt. Philip, U.S. Air Force 68
Pollard, Pvt. Wallace, U.S. Army 69
Portman, Sfc. Paul Jean, Jr., U.S. Army 70
Ulrich, C.M. Sgt. Gurney, Air National Guard 71
Wilkerson, Sfc. Claude, U.S. Army 72
Written committee questions and their response:
Chairman Daschle to Colorado National Guard 73
Chairman Daschle to South Dakota National Guard 74
Chairman Daschle to Chief Master Sergeant Ulrich 75
Chairman Daschle to Master Sergeant Noe 76
Chairman Daschle to Master Sergeant Cathey 77
Chairman Daschle to Airman Coleman 78

NEW GI BILL AND H.R. 3747, VETERANS' EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1986

TUESDAY, MAY 27, 1986

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT,
COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 1 p.m., in room PO-5, Porter Administration Building, 7039 East 18th Street, University of Denver, Denver, CO, Hon. Thomas A. Daschle (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Representative Daschle.

OPENING STATEMENT OF CHAIRMAN DASCHLE

Mr. DASCHLE. The hearing will come to order.

I want to thank everybody for joining us this afternoon. The hearing held this afternoon by the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee on Education, Training and Employment is being held to review H.R. 3747, the Veterans' Education Amendments of 1986 and the New GI Bill.

When Congress enacted the New GI Bill in 1984, we established an important, cost-effective program that will help keep our military strong and stable, enrich the lives of our service members, and will benefit our country as a whole.

During hearings we held last November, we received testimony indicating that the New GI Bill is already proving to be the highly efficient recruitment tool we said it would be. Statistics confirm what we who supported the New GI Bill knew: that meaningful education benefits attract smart young people into the Armed Forces. Over half of the eligible recruits are participating in the program provided for the active duty force, and I understand that more than 21,000 members of the National Guard and Selected Reserve are already attending school under the program designed for those components of our Armed Forces.

We on the Veterans' Affairs Committee are very proud of the newest bill, but we know that it can be an even better program. Witnesses who appeared at our hearing last fall suggested ways in which the effectiveness of this new program could be maximized. Provisions of H.R. 3747 are based on the impressive testimony we heard last November.

Today we are fortunate to be receiving the testimony of those who will be most directly affected by the provisions of H.R. 3747—

military recruiters, new recruits, senior NCO's, and leaders of our National Guard and Reserve components.

The importance of field hearings cannot be overstated. We need the comments and input from those of you at the grassroots level. Your testimony will be invaluable as we proceed with this legislation when we return to Washington.

I am sure that all of you know that the President included a proposal to terminate the New GI Bill in his budget request. Fortunately, there are recent indications that the administration is revising its position on this program. In fact, Jim Miller, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, has called the chairman of the full committee, Sonny Montgomery, to tell him the administration is backing off from its opposition to the New GI Bill. We think this is a very wise decision.

We have a great many witnesses today and we want to have plenty of time to hear from all of you. To begin, Mr. Philip Gauthier, representing the University of Colorado Law School is here.

I want to thank you personally for your hospitality, cooperation, and the tremendous assistance you have been to me and my staff as we prepared for this hearing. We very much appreciate that cooperation, Mr. Gauthier.

Mr. GAUTHIER. Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the university and the law school, we are most pleased to have you. I hope you will come back anytime. The facilities are open to you anytime.

We hope you will make use of them. We are pleased to have you.

Mr. DASCHLE. Thank you very much. We are grateful to be here. We want to stay long enough to enjoy your surroundings.

Mr. GAUTHIER. Glad to have you.

Mr. DASCHLE. Thank you.

Our first witness is somebody who needs no introduction to this committee, Pat Schroeder, a Member of Congress from Denver.

Pat, we are delighted you are here and we will take your testimony at this time.

STATEMENT OF HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF COLORADO

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

As a close, personal friend of mine, there is nobody I would rather have in Denver. We are very, very happy that you are here and that you have selected Denver as the beginning of these regional hearings on the New GI Bill.

I think Denver is a wise choice, subjectively, but objectively I think it is also a very wise choice because it not only has the regional headquarters of the VA, but it has phenomenal educational opportunities statewide.

We have 14 State colleges and universities, 11 community colleges and seven local district colleges, not to mention the many other trade, technical, vocational training institutes and so forth.

One particular program run by Denver's Metropolitan State College is specifically for veterans education. The Veterans' Upward Bound helps vets first finish high school, which is very, very important, and then continue on through college.

Its program's existence and success depends on a high population of vets with educational aspirations. We feel there have been many in this area.

I think that the fact that you are focusing on the very importance of the GI bill, and how critical it is to our All-Volunteer Force is wonderful. I don't sit on the Veterans' Affairs Committee, as you know, but I sit on the Armed Services Committee and my main concern has been in the personnel area.

I sit on that subcommittee. We were very pleased when we got this passed into law in 1984. I think to take it away so fast is totally unfair and people will feel that they were cheated one more time.

The other thing that has been so amazing to me, as it is brand new, but when you look at the recruiting statistics, what a phenomenal tool it has become, that is very important.

As you look at all the other things that are happening to today's military, this becomes more and more important. The decline of the dollar in Europe means that our hundreds of thousands of troops stationed overseas are taking substantial pay cuts.

Their time over there is being extended because we don't have the money to rotate them through and you also see another very serious thing happening, and that is that people are making moves on retirement benefits and other such benefits.

So if we don't have a GI bill, I don't know how we are going to have the force we need to really protect this country. I don't think it has been any secret, that I have always tended to look very skeptically at some of the high tech, big ticket weapons we have had, and felt too often we were putting much too much money in that part without realizing that those things aren't going to do anything by themselves, that you need to have good people to man them and run them, and if you don't have anybody that knows how to man them and run them, and people who are available and well trained, then they are not worth a thing.

They just sit there. So this was one of the ways we in the Congress in 1984, on the Armed Services Committee, and you on the Veterans' Affairs Committee, thought we could guarantee—we could keep our recruiting numbers up, that we would never slide again back to where we have been in the past. I think to knock it out now would really be one more blow to the morale of people who are serving this country.

The tragedy of our Defense budget is that the people making money in it are not the people in uniform. People making money from it are wearing three-piece suits working for major corporations.

I think your courage in coming out here and making a real stand for the GI bill regionally, showing people how important it is, is one of the reasons the administration is starting to back off its proposal, and hopefully, the testimony today will help.

So I thank you very much. Again, we welcome you to Denver.

[The prepared statement of Congresswoman Schroeder appears on p. 49.]

Mr. DASCHLE. Thank you, Pat.

What kind of response have you had from recruiters in the Denver area? Have you found any difficulties with a program as new as this in implementation?

Have you heard of any experiences through your office that would lead us to come to some conclusion about changes with the bill?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. We hear lots of things, but the main thing we have heard, that I emphasize over and over again, is how astounded people are at how successful this has been as a recruiting tool.

I think that any difficulties with it get totally overwhelmed by the positive response that has come forward. So there are always a few technical things that you may be able to do here and there, but they are so minor compared to the positive aspects that we see, and everybody knows what it costs to get an education these days, how costly that is.

Everybody, I think, also knows that the taxpayer is going to get every dime of this back over and over and over again because the more money you pay for education, the higher income they are probably going to make which only means they will pay more taxes, so it all gets recouped.

I think it is very positive and we have heard nothing but very good statements about it, and people are dismayed at the proposal to do away with it.

Mr. DASCHLE. What kind of acceptance have you found among the campuses in this area?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Campuses are delighted with it also, because they are seeing huge cutbacks everywhere else. Our State is not in the best of economic health. We have had a State with a very good student aid program, but it is quivering and shaking as the budget contracts in the State.

We know what has happened with student aid at the Federal level. So I find universities and colleges delighted to have this, because they all really want to educate people. It is like nobody wants to be in an emergency ward and say we are not going to let you in, even though you are sick, because you can't pay. Nobody wants to say that to the young people of America either.

I think the GI bill is a wonderful compromise because we are saying you serve, we educate. Now, if we can't say that as a Nation, we are in real trouble.

We all know this next generation is going to need more education, not less. If we can't make that statement, we are in worse shape than I thought we were.

Mr. DASCHLE. As a member of the Armed Services Committee, you have always been concerned with and interested in manpower issues and needs. From a manpower point of view, I can't imagine a more effective tool we have than the New GI Bill. I really appreciate the leadership you have shown on the Armed Services Committee for this program.

You were one of the leaders in getting this program implemented and, we are very pleased to have your continued support now.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I thank you very much. I think, too, if you look at the cost of the program, it is very, very small compared to the rewards that we reap.

People forget that the servicemen are also contributing at the time they do that. So I think it would be outrageous to let this fall through the cracks when we are spending so much money. I thank you for focusing on it.

Mr. DASCHLE. Thank you, Pat.

I would like to invite you to come to the dais. We have three Members of Congress from Colorado and they are all invited to join me following their testimony.

Mr. DASCHLE. The second witness is a very close friend, one who has been actively involved in many of these issues for a long period of time, someone certainly interested in education, and the issues of employment, Tim Wirth. Tim, we are pleased you could join us this afternoon. We invite you to proceed. The entire text of your statement will be submitted for the record.

STATEMENT OF HON. TIMOTHY WIRTH, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF COLORADO

Mr. WIRTH. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Welcome to Denver. We are delighted to have you here.

I would like to start out by associating myself with the remarks of the preceding witness, who, with her usual eloquence and precision, was able to summarize the issue in a very careful and thoughtful fashion.

Let me be frank, Mr. Chairman. The primary reason why we should continue to support the new and improved GI bill is to strengthen our national defense. It is good defense policy as well as being very sound educational policy, and very good social policy within a democratic society.

Let me take each one of those three issues, if I might, and summarize those. I have a full statement I would like to have included in the record, if I might.

Mr. DASCHLE. Without objection.

Mr. WIRTH. In terms of defense policy, we know the defense as established throughout our economy—we are going to need an increasingly able, well-educated, well-trained group of people to man the defense establishment as we do to man our economy.

This is becoming a more and more technological defense world and one in which we are going to need better trained people and people who are more capable coming into the military. No question about the fact that this, the New GI Bill, has been very, very effective at bringing in a much higher quality of people into the military.

The averages are familiar to you and to all of us who have dealt with this issue over the years. It is good defense policy. It is also good long-term social policy for the country.

You will remember the agony that we went through in the early 1970s during the times of the Vietnam war as to who was to serve and who was not going to serve. The inequities that we had related to our Armed Forces were legion, and created very significant divisions within our society. What was happening is that people who were more affluent weren't serving; people who were less affluent were serving.

In a democratic society we can't presume to have a military force that isn't representative of the whole of our society. The GI bill has provided the kinds of incentives to make sure that we have a total fabric of American society going into the military. That is very fundamental for us if we assume a citizen army, which is basically what we have, that a citizen army is reflective of the society overall, a very healthy, strong social policy for us to be pursuing as well.

Finally, in terms of long term investments, good economics, we know, as Mrs. Schroeder pointed out, we are going to need a group of young people, better able than their parents, to manipulate ideas, numbers and technology, and this presents yet another opportunity for us to make investments that will be paid off to the society very, very handsomely.

We know that probably the best investment we can make is the investment in education. We learned that from our experience with the GI bill.

We have learned that with one education program after another. The New GI Bill is no different from previous investments we made. So it is good economic policy as well.

Finally, I would point out that if we do not continue in the direction in which we are going with the GI bill and the recruitment to come out of it, we are going to be in real trouble in the 1990's. If you look at demographic patterns, we have fewer and fewer young people who are of age going into the military service.

If we do not continue the kind of aggressive recruitment policy we have now, we are not going to be able to man the military in the 1990's as we have to. We are going to need, by early 1990's, one out of every two non-college adults going into the military.

Now, how are we going to recruit that against all of the other demands in the society? That, again, goes right back to good defense policy, good social policy, and good educational policy to continue the program as we have it now. Does it need change?

I think it can be changed and helped with your legislation, H.R. 3747, of which I am proud to be a supporter. I think that makes sense to add a greater flexibility and adaptability to the GI bill in allowing for greater training programs, during a process of going to school, more apprenticeship programs and so on.

I think that that kind of flexibility is what we need, both for this legislation and overall for our economy and training. So I commend you both on that legislation and again for coming to Colorado and conducting this set of hearings around the country on this enormously important issue.

Thank you very much for asking me. I am delighted to be here.

[The prepared statement of Congressman Wirth appears on p. 51.]

Mr. DASCHLE. Thank you very much for that excellent statement, Tim.

You mentioned that one of the main criteria for a bill of this kind is obviously the need to strengthen our own national defense. Obviously, we have some people that are going to be testifying this afternoon about the relationship the GI bill has had to the National Guard and the Army Reserves.

Never before has the GI bill been available to the National Guard and Reserves. What kind of acceptance have you found in your district with regard to the bill and its availability to the Guard?

Mr. WIRTH. Very strong. I think you are seeing Guard units, Reserve units, that were having great difficulty, 4, 5, 6 years ago filling their complement now being much more successful.

You will have witnesses later this afternoon who will have numbers more specifically than I, but the sense I get is not dissimilar from that Mrs. Schroeder has gotten, that the acceptance has been very broad by those reserve units in meeting their targets, and the willingness of young people to serve and become involved in that has been enhanced by the incentive provided to them through the GI bill.

Mr. DASCHLE. How do you respond to the critics that you and I both heard in the Congress that there are less expensive options that we can use for educating the Guard, the Reserves, and veterans in general? VEAP is the most commonly mentioned, but what options do you find available that would provide a better opportunity than the GI bill?

Have you found any?

Mr. WIRTH. You have a fabric of a whole lot of competing goals. The purpose of this isn't to do things as cheaply as possible. The purpose of this is to have good defense policy, good manpower defense, good long-term economics for the country, as I suggested earlier, good social policy for the country, all of these.

You can't quantify every one of those. The OMB examiner in there with an eye shade and a sharp pencil probably has little feeling for the incentives of recruiting people to units, the need to bring in a cross section of people into our military.

That is not what he is paid to do. That is what you and I are paid to do, and that is why all of us, I hope, would resoundingly discourage the administration from pursuing its course of short-changing the current New GI Bill.

Mr. DASCHLE. You have obviously looked at our bill. Do you have any recommendations for additional changes that we may not have covered in the bill that we are reviewing today?

Mr. WIRTH. This has been with us for a short period of time, and I do believe we ought to give it a longer period of time to germinate. The success is so clear now from all indication that except for the changes which you have recommended, I would think let's leave it, let's let it work and let's have another hearing a year from now and similar people come back, or maybe 2 years from now and reflect once again on the program and see if it works at that point, but it is much too early to make, it seems to me, other judgments for change at this point. That would be shortsighted and foolish.

Mr. DASCHLE. Pat, any questions?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Not really. I just want to thank you for being here and thank you for caring about all this. I think you are exactly right.

The whole name of the game is to leave something level for a while without changing the rules every other day. I feel sorry for

recruiters not knowing what they are supposed to be recruiting for, to get a whole new book every other hour.

Thank you very much for being here.

Mr. WIRTH. Always nice to be in your congressional district, as well.

Mr. DASCHLE. I don't know quite where the line is drawn here between congressional districts.

Mr. WIRTH. It is very clear. Ask the next witness Mr. Kramer where all those districts come apart. It is very hard to tell from time to time.

Thank you very much, Mr. Daschle. Please to be here.

Mr. DASCHLE. Thank you.

Mr. DASCHLE. Our next witness is, again, no stranger to the issue. Ken Kramer has been a Congressman from this area for some time. Ken, we are delighted you could join us this afternoon to share your thoughts with us.

This whole issue is obviously one in which both parties are very heavily involved. It is an issue that clearly has bipartisan support.

Please proceed. You entire statement will be submitted for the record.

STATEMENT OF HON. KEN KRAMER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF COLORADO

Mr. KRAMER. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I am pleased to be here in the company of such a fine and distinguished colleague.

I want to thank you for your work in Agent Orange. Your leadership, I think, has focused on an important problem that now something is being done about. I think if one person was instrumental in that, it was certainly you.

Mr. DASCHLE. Thank you.

Mr. KRAMER. Secondly, I want to thank you for the hearing you held in Washington a couple of weeks ago, and I want you to know, at least in terms of the Denver office, things are much improved as a consequence of that hearing. GNMA has waived its separate appraisal requirements and, indeed, we were able to put some part-time people in overtime to work in a way—I think 5,000 cases of backlog have already been reduced.

Mr. DASCHLE. Great.

Mr. KRAMER. I congratulate you on that. You have got two for two, and this looks perhaps like three for three.

Our Nation's armed services are the shield by which our Nation is able to defend itself and remain strong. As the need for vigilance grows ever stronger, the Congress and the administration must be just as vigilant in maintaining and, where possible, enhancing the strength and the vitality of our Armed Forces.

In this age of volunteer service, the personnel needs of the various services must be monitored on a continual basis so the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and the Marines can be assured of meeting their recruitment and retention goals. Only by attracting and retaining quality men and women can our Armed Forces carry out their missions.

To that end, Mr. Chairman, let me say that I fully support the present GI bill, which has been in effect since last July. As you know, the services and the Department of Defense agree that because this bill has been in effect for only a short time, its effects on recruitment and retention are difficult to gauge. But some of the preliminary data is encouraging, to say the least.

How well is the GI bill working? Let me cite some examples. The Army has experienced a 38 percent increase in what it calls high-quality recruits in the first quarter of fiscal year 1986, compared with the same period a year earlier when the program was not in effect. The Navy and the Air Force have experience similar gains, as have the Army and Air Force Reserve, and the Army and the Air National Guard. The same is also true of both the Army and the Air National Guard.

As we receive data in the coming months from the studies and the surveys being conducted now, I am confident they will show that participation in the program, as well as recruitment and retention rates by the services, will all be greatly increased. That is good news for the armed services and good news for America.

Because the benefits and the advantages of the present GI bill are so evident, it is equally clear that we must resist attempts by the administration and the Senate to return to the old Veterans Educational Assistance Program, or VEAP.

That system has shown to have a negative effect on recruitment and retention, with low participation and little enthusiasm by our men and women in the services. For example, Mr. Chairman, the Air Force reported only a 6 percent participation rate in the old VEAP. The present GI bill, on the other hand, already has a participation rate of 38 percent, and that figure is growing.

Our Active Forces are not the only ones to benefit. I have mentioned the gains made by the Reserves and the National Guard in terms of enlistment and retention. Those gains are understandable, since the old program all but eliminated participation by reservists. Mr. Chairman, I don't need to remind you or anyone else of the vital role that the Reserves and the National Guards play in our Nation's defense. Just as our Active Forces must remain strong, so must our Reserves, especially at a time when budget restraints are pushing the limits on what we can do with respect to the active duty force.

Thus, let me repeat, attempts to return to the old program are wrong and should be defeated. The increasing complexity of modern warfare and the needs of the services to seek out and retain bright, qualified and hard-working people can be juxtaposed with the fact that today, young people have so many different opportunities. Given that combination, we must ensure that the services remain an attractive option for people to choose. Keeping the present GI bill is one of the best ways to do that.

I know the committee, Mr. Chairman, is considering ways to amend the GI bill and to expand the kinds of educational options that would be available to military personnel, certainly these proposals are worthy of consideration.

Obviously, there are more educational options today than 4-year colleges and universities. Technical and vocational schools, apprenticeships, community colleges, and on-the-job training programs

provide a rich variety for young men and women who have completed their military service.

At the same time, it is apparent that technical and vocational schools, as well as community colleges, are more attractive to the mechanically inclined and others who might not have considered the armed services in their plans but, who might do so if the range of post-service educational options was expanded. And certainly, Mr. Chairman, the services would welcome these kinds of individuals in our increasingly mechanized, computerized age.

So while I think the amendments to the present GI bill deserve every consideration, I also urge you to use caution as we review budgetary considerations. The amended version of the GI bill as represented in H.R. 3747 will cost more money simply because that many more individuals are likely to participate. We recognize, Mr. Chairman, that there are offsetting savings in terms of greater enlistment and retention rates, and the resulting decrease in training costs to the services. These savings may very well be realized. Nonetheless, in a time of budgetary constraints, we must weigh any plans to add spending carefully.

To that end, I might offer two suggestions. One, we take a "wait and see" attitude on the expansion of the existing program until we have had several years of data to review and to look at.

Secondly, if the committee does make a determination that it is appropriate to continue now to expand, without waiting until we have an opportunity 2 years down the road to make a review, maybe we ought to consider adjusting the service man's own educational contribution in a way in which increased participation could possibly be accommodated at no additional cost to the taxpayer. At least that strikes me as something that ought to be looked at and in which potentially both the services and the taxpayers could come out winners on and, most importantly, the servicemen, at least in the context of this program.

Let me close by reiterating my support for the present GI bill and for our efforts to help the armed services attract and keep quality people whose dedication and sacrifice keep our nation strong and free.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for coming to Denver. I know Representative Schroeder is happy to accommodate you in the heart of the first congressional district, and also thank you for letting me appear before your committee.

Mr. DASCHLE. Ken, thank you very much for coming and for offering your suggestions. I appreciate it very much.

You mentioned that this is obviously a far more successful program than the VEAP. That seems to be the consensus among active and reserves, military, and among the veteran and military organizations. In your own experience, why do you feel the GI bill has been more readily accepted than the old VEAP?

Mr. KRAMER. Well, I think it is simply a more attractive opportunity for education, that if you are willing to pitch in and do your share in the military to keep your country free and to keep it safe, then your country is going to be appreciative of your efforts and try to make your own transition to the private sector a lot easier and give you a better opportunity to make a way of life for yourself with higher earning potential.

Certainly I think this bill certainly does add in a way that the other bill does not. Given the high cost of education today, I just do not think the old program offered sufficient incentive to want to participate.

Mr. DASCHLE. You mentioned in your testimony that perhaps one way to ensure that we can cover budgetary considerations and whatever expansion we may make with the New GI Bill, is to increase the level of contribution made by the GI bill participant.

Are you suggesting that for those specific additional services provided—in other words, if a person would pursue on-the-job-training, that person would experience a greater reduction in his or her basic pay than someone going to, a 4-year accredited college?

Mr. KRAMER. Not necessarily. I think coming up with the appropriate formulas, all the options ought to be considered. Obviously that is one of them, maybe something that ought to be looked at across the board.

I recognize if you look at it across-the-board, to some extent obviously those attending, or who would otherwise have attended the 4-year, are in effect giving up a little bit of their benefit so that others that would choose another option, whether it be vocational, on-the-job training or something else, might also be able to share in the program.

Mr. DASCHLE. So you are suggesting that perhaps everybody participate in the GI bill——

Mr. KRAMER. That may be another way to approach it. I think we would want the benefit of the services' wisdom in terms of trying to figure out who goes to what opportunity, if given the chance in terms of skewing that in a way that make sense.

What I am trying to do—I recognize this is a very meritorious program. If we were running a surplus I would say, sure, let's go ahead and expand it now. It makes sense. We want to have a lot of mechanically inclined people.

Not everybody is perfectly suited for the typical 4 year, liberal arts curriculum. Others would prefer different opportunities, and why should we discriminate against those in favor of a particular type of educational discipline?

But the reality is that we are looking at a $2 trillion-plus national debt. We are looking at $182 billion deficit that would have been higher had petroleum, energy costs, and interest rates not come down.

So I think we have to look at any meritorious program in the context of affordability. I am very much opposed to going backwards, going back to VEAP. But on the other hand, I have felt all along that if we are going to indeed do something about this monstrous national debt and annual national deficit, that each area of the budget must do its fair share. It is very difficult, I think, no matter how meritorious a program might be, to advocate in this kind of environment something that simply will cost more money without at least exploring ways that might be able to sort of kill two birds with one stone, give us the benefit of an expanded program, but at the same time try to keep the bottom line cost about the same as it would have been under the law as it now exists.

Mr. DASCHLE. Well, once again, thank you very much for your testimony this afternoon. Tim and Pat, do either of you have any questions?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I just wanted to clarify one thing.

Thank you for being here, Ken. Again, I just wanted to go a little further on this increasing the servicemen's educational contribution. It is now $100 a month coming out of their pay if they opt to go into the program.

Mr. KRAMER. Right.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. So you are saying increase it. How much more would you increase it?

Mr. KRAMER. I don't have a figure. There is a number of options that might be explored. Maybe you would want to have a different pattern for the people on the low end of the pay scale as opposed to people who might be officers or something of that sort.

I am just saying that it is one option that ought to be at least looked at that might allow us to expand the availability of benefits without increasing cost.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I know one option is $50 a month for 2 years if you are of lower pay, but you are talking about not that flexibility, but you are talking about for the flexibility of increasing the amount, on like a progressive scale depending on their income?

Mr. KRAMER. That is a possibility. I don't come in front of the committee, I think, saying I have the ultimate wisdom on this issue, and this is the answer.

I am just saying a lot of the full gamut of options ought to be considered. If we feel it makes more sense to go ahead and expand the opportunities, rather than take another 2 years and get more data on the existing program as it exists with just simply a more limited educational experience available, if we are going to do that, I think at least we owe it to the taxpayers, and I think we owe a commitment to doing something about deficits, to see whether or not there isn't a way to do that and accomplish that objective without increasing the bottom line funding of the program.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. But I think the bottom line is still you want to have this as a benefit to attract people to the services, which you certainly agree with.

Mr. KRAMER. Correct. Absolutely.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. You wouldn't want to discriminate with people who wanted to go to one kind of college versus another. You would still want that to be available; right?

Mr. KRAMER. I think right now we are limited in what we are considering here. I think we have three options. Do we go back to the old program pre-existing summer of 1985? I think we are all very much agreed we don't want to do that, that that was counterproductive to attracting high quality people and also retaining them, and that our military capability has vastly increased as a consequence of the new program.

So I think at least if I understand all the testimony thus far, I think we are all pretty much agreed on that. It is good news the chairman brings with him in terms of the administration changing its position on that issue. The second issue thus becomes do we move forward from the existing program and expand the opportunities that are available.

If we do that, how are we going to pay for it, or do we simply hold the existing program in place another couple of years, gather additional data on what it does to retention and recruitment and then make a decision, say, at the end of 1988 when I believe the present program runs out as to whether or not we want to change any of it.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I see what you are saying. I guess my option would be that I think the goal is to have people be able to be educated however they desire people to use this in the most flexible manner.

Mr. KRAMER. Absolutely.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Thank you very much.

Mr. DASCHLE. Tim, any questions?

Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Chairman, you deal with these issues all the time, Ken, day-in and day-out as a member of the Armed Services Committee. When we talk about readiness and preparation of the Armed Forces and so on, is the kind of effort and emphasis that we put on training people, and on the incentives of good people coming in part of an emphasis on readiness?

Would that be the kind of quality we want to have? Would you put it in that account?

Mr. KRAMER. Well, I think obviously the capability of the people, you know, who operate the systems and the machines have a major impact on the effectiveness of the equipment. You can't have machines that simply are going to provide for the national defense in and of themselves.

The people skills are certainly at least half of the equation and probably a whole lot more as we can cite historical examples where dedicated, motivated people overwhelmed seemingly insurmountable odds.

So in the generic sense, I think the capability of the people certainly does have a bearing on readiness. I am not sure it is viewed by the services, however, in that traditional context when they define readiness.

Mr. WIRTH. The reason I ask, it seems to me with the administration's proposal to cut back on the New GI Bill, to change it and go back where we were, where we see once again a set of priorities coming out of the administration that says what we are going to do is to put more emphasis on hardware and less emphasis on the training, readiness side of things, which I think most of us agree is not a good thing to do.

We have got to have a better balance in this. Is that what is going on here in the administration's initial proposal?

Mr. KRAMER. I hope not. Without getting too political about it——

Mr. WIRTH. I am trying to see where the distinction gets drawn.

Mr. KRAMER. The quality of the personnel has vastly increased over the last 5 or 6 years. The administration has got to choose priorities in the context of spending. My own—I don't make any secret about this and some have charged it to be an oversimplistic solution, but I think in order to do something about this problem of deficits we all sort of have to be in the same boat together.

I, for one, strongly emphasized the need to sort of freeze spending across-the-board so we all feel we are all sort of part of this.

The problem is when you start making exceptions, everyone wants to be the exception rather than the rule. This new proposal is very meritorious. It makes a whole lot of sense in terms of what we want to do to enhance, as you would put it in the larger sense, readiness, but it also has to be viewed in the context of overall affordability.

There are an awful lot of good programs out there that potentially could be funded and, once we start that cycle, I don't know where we draw the line.

Mr. WIRTH. I just have two points I wanted to ask about.

One, if this sort of falls into a readiness fix and which I think it does. I think we in the Congress have a responsibility to put more emphasis on manpower, training and so forth, and that is something in my own view that has been skewed a bit away from that, and we have a responsibility to pull the pendulum back in that direction.

Mr. KRAMER. I can say Representative Schroeder, and certainly Chairman Aspin have done very fine work to make sure that the military does not become totally systems oriented.

Mr. WIRTH. The other point is going to the Daschle legislation, are we in a situation that that is in fact—has this been costed out as costing more money, H.R. 3747?

Mr. KRAMER. That is the information I would have. It isn't because the additional educational opportunities are more expensive than the ones that are already provided for under existing law. It is simply because in fact in many instances the community college or the vocational experience may be much cheaper than the 4-year traditional education.

But it is simply because the projections are—you know as well as I that when the Government makes projections, you had better look out—but the projections are that there would simply be a larger body of people who would avail themselves of the opportunity, and as a consequence of a lot more increased participation, the cost would go up.

Mr. WIRTH. Let me just see if I understand it.

If I was somebody who spent 3 years in the military and had paid into the New GI Bill and had the matching benefits, I could come out and go to Metro, but I couldn't go into a vocational training program; is that right?

Mr. KRAMER. That is my understanding. That is correct. That is my understanding.

Mr. WIRTH. But there is a fixed amount of money that I would have to spend, isn't that right? There is a fixed amount of money that would be available for my education from what I invested, and what the Government had matched with so it does not make any difference, it seems to me, whether I use that money to go to Metro or whether I use that money to go to the Schroeder High Tech Training Program.

There is still going to be $10,000 available. Why does that then cost more money?

Mr. KRAMER. Because the participation rates would go up so much.

Mr. WIRTH. So what we are doing is saying to people who don't want to go on to higher education in a formal sense—it is your bill, Tom. I am just trying to understand what the numbers of this are.

Mr. DASCHLE. CBO has recently analyzed this. They have indicated certainly the cost of the program as we have now described it, even with the additional services to be provided, is really very minimal.

The major costs incurred are really in two areas. The first is the delay that we will now see from going from $100 a month to $50 a month for 2 years rather than to try to do all this in 1 year.

The second is the creation of the fund in the Veterans' Administration. So on both counts, ultimately it is a paper deficit that will largely be made up.

But as far as the actual tools being used, it is like the same tool box where you have added a couple of tools, and you have a choice of using one or the other rather than creating a whole new tool box of tools.

But certainly there are opportunities here whereby veterans will use the GI bill that weren't there before. That has to be factored in, but as I say, according to CBO, that is a negligible cost compared to the other two provisions.

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I am not sure whose these numbers are, to be honest with you, but I have a 5-year projection here that would indicate that the total spending on VEAP, which was the old program if we were to go back to that, would be $316 million.

The total 5-year spending under the bill as it is presently structured would be $691 million. But if H.R. 3747 were added onto it in its existing form, that would go up to $862 million, which would be a 5-year increase of $171 million. I can tell you this, that if the numbers turned out that these are inaccurate and that, in effect, we could do the expanded job for the same amount of cost, I would sure jump on the bandwagon without any reservation whatsoever.

I am not sure where those numbers might——

Mr. DASCHLE. Let me ask. I am not sure either, and I would like to be able to clarify for the record.

I think I am going to ask staff to explain it for us. Jill Cochran is our subcommittee counsel, and it is a good question. I would like to clarify it myself.

Mr. KRAMER. Maybe I am operating under misinformation.

Ms. COCHRAN. VEAP in the long run will cost less money than the New GI Bill. No one has ever disagreed with that. In terms of H.R. 3747, a good deal of the cost is the result of the creation of a fund in the Veterans' Administration that consists of the $1200 contributed by the service member. Right now that money reverts to the Treasury.

Under H.R. 3747 that money would simply be diverted to the VA and allow the VA to pay the basic benefit. Now, the way CBO does cost estimates, which is a mystery to all of us from time to time, this fund is going to show as a cost.

In point of fact, it is a paper cost because the money will ultimately be expended, under any circumstance somewhere. In this case we are earmarking it for the payment of these benefits, but it shows up as a sizable amount of money.

There is also a definite impact because of the delay of the income from service members when the contribution goes from $100 a month to $50 a month.

The cost of, for example, for flight training, technical training, on-the-job training, however, is really quite small. I understand from CBO they make there determinations based on an analysis of the number of people who will enter the military, and participate in the New GI Bill, solely because of the availability of those programs.

Mr. KRAMER. Do they show—I assume to get these numbers for participation, at least in some of the aspects I covered, was 38 percent, up from 6 percent.

Do you have any indication of what that kind of participation rate would go to?

Ms. COCHRAN. With the inclusion of these new programs?

Mr. KRAMER. Exactly.

Ms. COCHRAN. I couldn't tell you that. I will have to read through this again and see if they get specific.

There is cost associated with this bill. We don't argue that, but, to a large degree, this is a paper cost. Some of it does have to do again with the change from $100 a month to $50 a month. That is going to increase participation. That is the expectation.

Mr. DASCHLE. The figure you have is $171 million. I have never seen that figure, but I would like to pursue it.

Mr. KRAMER. I will gather more information.

Mr. DASCHLE. Is that an OMB figure?

Mr. KRAMER. I assume it is.

Mr. DASCHLE. CBO was not able to give us any specific figure of that kind, and that would be interesting to see.

Mr. KRAMER. I will report back to you forthwith.

Mr. DASCHLE. Ken, thank you very much.

Mr. DASCHLE. Our next witness is the Director of Educational Policy, U.S. Army, Col. Bruce Battey. Colonel Battey, we are pleased you could join us this afternoon. We look forward to your testimony.

The entire text of your statement will be submitted for the record, and you can proceed with your testimony in any way that you see fit.

STATEMENT OF COL. BRUCE BATTEY, DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION POLICY, U.S. ARMY

Colonel BATTEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you for the opportunity for making a statement before this committee. I do consider this an honor.

Sir, the U.S. Army is strongly committed to the belief that its membership be provided all growth opportunities. Hopefully my statement will add a bit of definition to that belief.

The Army shares the Nation's concern for the establishment of a strong educational base on which her citizens can grow and develop. That base directly impacts on the quality of our soldiers and those who lead them. Our ability to man, sustain, and train your Army depends on that partnership. Consequently, the provision of

educational opportunities to all soldiers for professional and personal growth is a standing Army policy.

The Army has initiated a project to increase soldier awareness and involvement in education. The project has been termed "Reaching for Excellence." We hope by 1990 to have 9 out of 10 soldiers in some education program. Right now it is about 5 out of 10. This initiative will enhance soldier and commander awareness of the value of education.

The value that new soldiers place on education is clearly evident in the numbers who are enrolling in the New GI Bill. The New GI Bill is recognized by new soldiers as an invitation to the pursuit of higher learning. The Army readily acknowledges and welcomes that desire for self growth since it will result in a higher performing soldier.

The Army has the capacity and the desire to be the national leader in providing educational opportunities. Secretary of the Army John O. Marsh and Army Chief of Staff John A. Wickham have stated that soldiers must not "view their time in the service as time lost from the campus, and that all soldiers must recognize * * * that education is a lifelong process."

Thousands of young men and women enter the Army from civilian life and return to that life each year. The impressions they receive regarding the value of education, and the actions they take to continue their education, while voluntarily serving, will have a lasting effect on society. Our ability to instill lifelong learning as a personal and professional challenge will result not only in an Army better prepared for the future, but a Nation as well. The New GI Bill enhances our ability to recruit young men and women who are committed to self-growth through education.

Informing soldiers of the significant role education plays in their future begins with the Army recruiter and continues at the Army reception station. The New GI Bill briefing stresses the important relationship between self growth and success, regardless of career intentions. There, new soldiers learn of the Army's desire to be a full partner in that growth.

Soldiers motivated to develop the whole person, personally and professionally, in the community and at home with the family, become our highest performing soldiers. And high performance soldiers form high performance units that ensure force readiness.

We believe education is fundamental to all that we do in life, and the Army relies on education's vital contribution to organizational growth. It determines how well we think, analyze, and communicate. Whether it is training assimilation, leadership development, manning, or sustaining the force, education is the capstone. Soldiers actively involved in educational pursuits are highly motivated, more mature, and committed.

Today's Army is the best ever. We have quality people, better trained and better equipped. Still, we recognize that change is constant and that our need to adjust and grow intellectually is ever present.

Education is our best investment for the future. The Army is accepting its moral and legal responsibility to make every effort to instill the desire for professional and personal educational growth in its membership. Soldiers are returning to their civilian lives

better prepared to meet the future. The Army and the New GI Bill form a formidable partnership that, working together, can ensure better soldiers and citizens, a ready Army and a stronger Nation.

Mr. DASCHLE. Thank you. I want to commend the Army. At our hearing last fall we were asking each one of the services what their participation was, and the degree to which they have had success with the New GI Bill. The Army's was phenomenal. It was just phenomenal, and it was, in part, due to the extensive advertising campaign that had been under way.

Has the doubt about the GI bill's future, resulting from the administration's recommendations to terminate, had any impact on your plans or your implementation of the program in the last couple of months?

Colonel BATTEY. Sir, perhaps someone in the recruiting end of our business should respond to that. I think they would probably give you a better answer.

From my perspective, I manage the Army's continuing education system. We view the new bill as vital to the ability to create the continuing spectrum of education that the young person must be helped in dealing with as they enter the Army, as they spend their time, and as they go out the other end.

We want to be able to turn them on initially, provide them opportunities while they are with us and then, of course—and that is where the bill comes in—be able to continue that as they go back into their life's pursuits, whatever that might be.

But I would defer on the earlier question.

Mr. DASCHLE. If you were asked to put a graph together indicating the degree to which the Army has become intricately involved with the GI bill as a recruitment tool, as well as a means by which to encourage educational advancement among new members, would the graph be a straight line?

Would it have its peaks and valleys?

How would you see the graph a year after the implementation of the New GI Bill?

Colonel BATTEY. In terms of the usage of the bill?

Mr. DASCHLE. That is correct.

Colonel BATTEY. Sir, I think with the initiatives we have got under way, there can be no question but that the use of the bill will rise steadily over the coming years. As soldiers become participants in educational growth, they will look for a means to continue that growth when they leave us, and the GI bill is the answer for them.

Mr. DASCHLE. Your "Reach for Excellence" program is obviously designed with many facets. The GI bill is one of them.

Colonel BATTEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. DASCHLE. In the array of different opportunities in your Reach for Excellence program, where does the GI bill fit? How many other parts are there to the program?

Colonel BATTEY. Well, there are a number of programs which assist soldiers all the way from help with basic academic skills through vocational/technical opportunities and then, of course, the traditional college opportunity all the way through as far as they want to personally pursue that effort. That is all assisted by tuition assistance dollars which the Congress has provided.

Some of the programs are done on duty when, in fact, they are job related. For example, basic academic skills help soldiers to be able to perform military jobs, that sometimes is done on duty.

The GI bill provides the ability to counsel the young soldier about starting the program, an educational program, and showing the soldier that it need not end when he or she leaves the Army. In fact there is a help, if you will, lying out there as they progress and make their own choices about where they are going in life.

In that regard, one of the enhancements to our Reaching for Excellence program will be the provision of much more comprehensive—I think the term used now-a-days in a lot of industry is outplacement. We see a need for much greater help on the part of the organization to the individual in helping the soldier find his place as he or she is about to leave the military service.

We will be working that, of course, through the American Council of Education and all the associations that represent the various types of institutions that are our academic community. In addition, we will be looking at the employment side as well, because many times full time schooling is not the answer for everybody.

But that needn't mean that education is going to stop either if one can't pursue it on a full time basis.

Mr. DASCHLE. Let me ask you one last question. From time to time among veterans I hear the term "parity" used; that we need to continue to strive to accomplish what most people would view as a parity in educational opportunities through the GI bill to what we had in post World War II years.

How close to parity do you think we have got with the New GI Bill?

Colonel BATTEY. Well, I am a Vietnam-era GI bill guy myself. I think we might equate that well with the post-World War II. I think the opportunity is very, very close to being on a par with what I am aiming for, for example. I think we have done a fine job with this bill.

There are some fixes. Of course, that is what you are considering, and I appreciate that.

Mr. DASCHLE. Well, Colonel Battey, thank you. We appreciate your coming this afternoon. Your testimony was excellent.

Colonel BATTEY. Thank you.

Mr. DASCHLE. We will now have a series of panels. The first panel will be comprised of Maj. Gen. John L. France, the Adjutant General of the Colorado National Guard; Maj. Gen. Ronald Williamson, who is the Adjutant General of the South Dakota National Guard, who is accompanied by Col. Harold Sykora, Vice Adjutant General of the South Dakota National Guard, and Col. Phil Killey, President, South Dakota National Guard Association.

Gentlemen, we are very pleased you are here, and that you have travelled so far, in some cases, to join us this afternoon. We consider your testimony to be crucial, really, as we analyze the New GI Bill. I can't think of a more important segment from whom we would want to hear than the National Guard.

We are cutting a lot of new ground here. We obviously are very concerned about the way that new ground is settling and whether or not, from your point of view, the whole program is working. General France, we will start with you.

STATEMENTS OF MAJ. GEN. JOHN L. FRANCE, THE ADJUTANT GENERAL OF THE COLORADO NATIONAL GUARD; MAJ. GEN. RONALD WILLIAMSON, THE ADJUTANT GENERAL OF THE SOUTH DAKOTA NATIONAL GUARD, ACCOMPANIED BY COL. HAROLD SYKORA, VICE ADJUTANT GENERAL OF THE SOUTH DAKOTA NATIONAL GUARD, AND COL. PHIL KILLEY, PRESIDENT, SOUTH DAKOTA NATIONAL GUARD ASSOCIATION

STATEMENT OF MAJ. GEN. JOHN L. FRANCE

General FRANCE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am pleased to be able to testify on the New GI Bill and the proposed amendment to H.R. 3747 as each affects soldiers and airmen of the National Guard.

I might add that I am also speaking on behalf of the Adjutant General Association of the United States, as I am the president of that organization. We represent nearly 600,000 people, as you well know, across this great United States.

The New GI Bill, used in conjunction with the enlistment and retention incentive programs is proving to be an effective tool. The New GI Bill has greatly enhanced our ability to compete in the market place.

The bill provides qualified Guard members with educational benefits up to $140 per month for 36 months or $5,040. As of the end of March, over 8,600 Army Guard members and 3,500 Air Guard members have received benefit checks from the Veterans' Administration.

Most Guard members who are already using the New GI Bill were members prior to the beginning of the program on the first of July who have reenlisted or extended to use the New GI Bill. We will not see any significant statistical data to indicate the impact of the new bill in recruiting until mid-summer when most of our new recruits become eligible—having completed 180 days of Guard service and also their initial active duty training since the first of July 1985.

The continually increasing demands of modernization and the need for a strong defense in a resource-constrained environment make it imperative that we retain and recruit the best soldiers and airmen society has to offer. While not targeted toward shortage skills or priority units like the incentive program, the New GI Bill will allow us to attract higher quality personnel who desire to continue their civilian education.

The New GI Bill will allow us to offer advanced educational opportunities which will have positive effects on readiness and training. As equipment and doctrine become more and more complex, we will be able to retain and recruit more of these highly skilled, motivated, and capable people with the New GI Bill. The bill is a significant retention tool because, unlike previous GI bills, the member must remain in an active status in the Selected Reserve in order to use the benefit.

As we look to an aggregate end strength growth for the Army and Air National Guard of 28,000 by fiscal year 1987, and continuing growth through fiscal year 1990, in the face of a shrinking youth market with competing civilian employment opportunities

and alternative life styles, we must have the tools to man and retain our force.

The Army Guard today represents almost half of the Army's combat units, while the Air Guard contributes more than half of the Air Force's air defense and more than 70 percent of its tactical communications and air traffic control. The increasing mission growth in the Army and Air Guard can be expected to continue through the next decade. We will need more good people to support this growth and the New GI Bill coupled with the incentives programs can help us get them.

I believe there are several changes to the New GI Bill that merit consideration. First among them is the restriction of program usage to only college level programs. The limitation that the New GI Bill may only be used for college level programs is unnecessarily strict.

Mr. Chairman, your proposed H.R. 3747 would partially correct this inequity. We fully support enactment of this change. Removing these restrictions and allowing attendance at technical and vocational schools on the same basis as is currently permitted in the New GI Bill for Active Forces would allow more individuals flexibility, and contribute to personnel and operational readiness.

Soldiers and airmen would be able to participate in technical programs that would sharpen not only their military skills, but also increase their value to their employers in the civilian market place.

As modernization continues to change the Guard and its equipment, we will need more and more technically skilled people, as will the private sector. H.R. 3747 also provides for apprenticeship and on-the-job training programs, both advancing the marketable skills of the individual and needs of the military.

Another area of concern is the credit hour requirement for the half-time monthly rate—currently 6-semester hours. The average Guard member maintains a full-time civilian job, has family and civic responsibilities and fulfills the role of a citizen soldier.

In addition to the 48 days of required drill training and the average 156 days of annual training, the Guard member contributes numerous nights and weekends to fulfill his responsibilities as a citizen soldier. We support the proposal in H.R. 3747 allowing payment at an appropriately reduced rate to Guard members who are attending only courses totaling less than 6 hours. This change would further encourage members to use the New GI Bill. Continued education would not severely impact on their already limited time with their families and would serve as a tool to maintain and increase retention.

The cost of a college education continues to spiral upward and represents a major investment of a family's resources. The New GI Bill is providing the opportunity for many young people to attend post-secondary schools who otherwise could not afford to do so.

As we learned from previous GI bills, benefits accrue not only to the individual and the military, but also to society as a whole. The increased level of education, better lifetime earning power and expanded education permits an individual to better cope with society's complexities.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the New GI Bill is a success and must be continued and improved as with the proposed amendment. In concert with our incentive programs, the New GI Bill is an aid to continued successes in retention and recruiting in the National Guard.

It is in keeping with the current practices in the private sector to both educate and motivate people. If we are to continue to be ready when called, the National Guard must attract, retain, and maintain educated and motivated members. Our missions require it. Our Nation's future demands it.

Mr. Chairman, we fully support enactment of H.R. 3747 and propose that the New GI Bill be adopted as a permanent program by Congress.

Mr. DASCHLE. Thank you, General France. That is an excellent statement.

I want to pursue some of your comments, if I could, but I think I would hold my questions until after the entire panel has had a chance to testify.

Mr. DASCHLE. General Williamson, it is always good to see you. Delighted that you could come as far as you have and invite you to proceed as you see fit.

STATEMENT OF MAJ. GEN. RONALD F. WILLIAMSON

General WILLIAMSON. Thank you, Congressman.

It is good to be here. I will make a few comments primarily relative to how the GI bill affects us in South Dakota, being most of the other people have talked on the national basis, and Harry and Phil have been so kind to let me speak for them.

So if we have any questions, then they get to answer the questions. I get to do the talking.

But back to first, commending you for having this hearing. I do that but primarily as you look around the room, I think you are to be commended for the type of people that you have here today and the young people we have, not only in the Guard and the Reserve, but also on active duty.

I am sure that their remarks will probably mean more to you and to the committee, and what you can take back than what John or I can say or whatever.

I do have to say that it is a privilege and honor to come to John's State because anytime another AG gets an opportunity to come to another State and brag about their State in another State, we look forward to that.

You know—you and I know how great the South Dakota Guard is. John is probably not too well aware of it. We are 3 to one.

He didn't bring anybody else with him so we are in good shape here. It gives him something to shoot for in Colorado.

General FRANCE. I have these guys surrounded.

General WILLIAMSON. Well, let me just take some of the statistics. Again, Tom, what you are probably aware of, but as they relate to South Dakota, and somewhat relate them to the GI bill, and the education benefits as they relate to South Dakota.

One, as you know, we are high as far as our recruiting rate in South Dakota. On the Army side of the House today we are at about 108 percent. On the Air Guard side of the House we are

about 101 percent. So you can't say that that is all because of the GI bill, but I do know that 2 years ago we were at like—Phil, correct me if I am wrong—we were down to about 96 percent on the Air Guard side, and we were at probably 102 percent on the Army side.

So, you know, you can do with the figures whatever you want to, but during this time frame something has had something to do with it. We could say as commanders we take all the credit, but I don't think that is the case.

I think you can look at the programs such as the GI bill. Then you take the other side that we deal with all the time. That is the retention side.

Obviously, retention is very important to us in the Guard. Probably our greatest attribute as far as the Guard, and what we can offer as far as a part of the total force, in that the more stable we can be and the longer we can keep people in the Guard, the better we are going to be able to maintain our equipment, the better we will be able to fly our equipment, the better we will be able to shoot our equipment, whatever it might be.

Again, statistics. On the Air Guard side, our retention rate was—today it has gone from 42 percent in the last about year-and-a-half—42 percent to 96 percent as far as retention is concerned.

On the Army side of the House we have increased about 30 percent. We have gone from about 50 percent retention rate to 80 percent.

Now, again you know, you can look at the economics. As you know, in South Dakota we have the agricultural problem, we have a lot of economic problems facing us. Maybe that is what is keeping them in the Guard. Who knows?

But we had some of those problems before. So I think you can look at the GI bill as being one of those very important factors that is helping us as far as the Guard is concerned.

The reason it is important to us in South Dakota, that we have something such as the New GI Bill as a benefit for our Guard people, is that we are a high percentage-wise State as far as Guard participation.

Nationwide, 1 out of 523 people on average participate in the Guard, in the Army Guard. In South Dakota we are 1 out of 164. We have only got 700,000 people, and we have got a limited number to deal with.

If we are going to maintain our high standards and our high level of recruiting, we have got to go after that limited number of people. Obviously we have the support of the State and of the communities, but the GI bill helps us in that area.

Participation in the program. On the Army side of the house we have over 300 people, plus soldiers, in the last year-and-a-half—over 300 that are participating in the GI bill.

In the Air Guard, since the enactment of the New GI Bill, 96 people have been recruited. Of those, 71 of those people are participating in the program. That is 75 percent.

I think, as has been pointed out very eloquently by the other people that have testified, it is not only the Guard that benefits, it is the total force, if you want to call it that, the active Army, Air Force, Navy, and also the educational institutions.

Our people in South Dakota are looking for an opportunity for higher education, and we can do that for them through the Guard. I think that is why it is such a popular program.

In conclusion, let me say, too, that I also have the opportunity, I guess one would call it, to serve as director of Selective Service in the State of South Dakota, which goes along with the job of Adjutant General.

I don't have a lot of work to do over there right now. I am busy enough with the Guard and everything else, and with the floods and so forth. In my personal opinion, and I think in the opinion of a lot of the people, if we do not have an incentive such as the New GI Bill, which has proven to be very successful, we might as well start looking at the draft again.

That is the only thing that is going to save, especially as far as the Guard is concerned, in my opinion. I really don't need the business over there.

I think it is much more progressive. It is a much more—it is a better program. It is not a negative type approach to having to serve your country which obviously we consider to be an honor, and one which we hope we can make attractive to our young people.

With that, if you have any questions, Mr. Chairman, we would be happy to answer them for you. I hope that by taking some of the figures and some of the facts as they relate to our State in South Dakota that that would give you some insight as to what we think of the program, and hopefully it is a little bit of a piece of how it does affect the other States throughout the country.

Thanks.

[The prepared statement of General Williamson appears on p. 53.]

[The prepared statement of Colonel Killey appears on p. 56.]

Mr. DASCHLE. Thank you for an excellent statement. I appreciate the information you have provided the committee regarding the impact of the New GI Bill in South Dakota. There are several different facets I want to explore briefly. One is retention. No one can put a dollar sign on the value of retention, but first I would like to have both generals, if you will, describe the value of retention as you see it and how you think retention will be enhanced by a program like this. General France.

General FRANCE. I would say that there is a figure, and as has been stated earlier today, you can do just about anything you want to with them. But it's somewhere between $17,000 and $25,000 to train the average soldier, so that when we lose those 20 percent—and that is a magnificent rate of retention, as a matter of fact, that Ron has spoken of. But when you lose those people and start adding up what it costs to replace them, already we are making money with the GI bill. I think that that's absolutely accurate. It will have a dramatic effect on our ability to retain people across the country, an absolute dramatic effect. I think every State will see a definite upturn in their capacity to keep people onboard.

I think one of the facets of the bill that probably is as meritorious as any other, is the fact that they have to be active in the Selective Reserve in order to participate in the program. That is different than what we have seen in the past. I know that there are

States that have retention rates that are abysmal, that have 40, 50 percent of the people going out the back door as the recruiters are frantically bringing them in the front door, and that is going to change because of this.

Mr. DASCHLE. Do you care to add anything to that?

General WILLIAMSON. I would certainly agree with that. As I think I said before, one of our strong points in the Guard, and one reason we can outshoot and outfly and outdo many times our brothers and sisters on the active side of the house, is because of the stability and the longevity we have with our people. The longer we can retain them, the better we will be, and the better asset we will be to this country as far as our national defense, notwithstanding the cost of the training. I might just ask Phil to comment a little bit, too. One of the areas that we have a difficult problem is in pilot training.

Phil, why don't you just touch on that just a little bit.

Colonel KILLEY. I would just like to say that I am Commander of the Air National Guard in South Dakota as well as the outgoing president of the Guard Association in South Dakota. Prior to coming into the Guard I was in active duty in the sixties and joint guard in the seventies.

I would just like to reiterate what General Williamson said about the strength of the Guard. We are flying modern equipment, the same equipment that the Air Force is flying. We are maintaining the same mission readiness, the same combat capability of our active-duty counterparts, but we are doing it with part-time people. The way we can do that is through stability and experience.

True, a lot of that experience that is in the Guard is in the technician full-time force. We average—and this is probably nationwide—17 to 18 years' experience, particularly in maintenance of aircraft, but our Guard people, that experience isn't nearly as high. With only 48 days, plus 15, to train those people on maintaining that modern equipment and flying it, the new GI bill is going to go a long way in upping the retention of our guardsmen, our part-time people. So I can't say enough. I really think this is going to enhance our overall experience level of our guardspeople as well and thereby increase the total capability of our total force.

Mr. DASCHLE. Let me make sure that I understand. Ron said he was going to speak for the two of you, but did you have statements you wanted to submit or provide in any way?

General WILLIAMSON. We have those submitted.

Mr. DASCHLE. Very good.

You have made an interesting statement. Obviously, as three Members of Congress have all indicated, we need to be concerned about cost, always. We certainly can't be talking out of both sides of our mouth, when you hear virtually every politician talk about the need for reducing the size of the deficit but at the same time insuring we have those things that are very important to our national agenda, especially when it relates directly to national security.

But your comment is one that has always been one that has encouraged me, General France; that is, that this program in essence pays for itself in the reduction in cost required necessarily to train

recruits and other personnel for the jobs that they hold once in the military. Does anyone on the panel care to elaborate on that?

General FRANCE. Well, I could say that we all know the figures from the other experiences with the GI bill. I wonder that they are as important as the other valuable things that have come from it, but I believe the figure is something like $3 for every $1 invested that goes back directly to the Federal Government as a result of GI bill programs in the past. It's going to be the same with this one.

I don't think there is any difference at all. We did hear some testimony having to do with the participation rates. As you know, the new bill does not discriminate amongst the people who will be eligible as did the old programs. The old education benefit programs were geared toward units in some cases, particular skills within both the Army and the Air National Guard, critical skills that these people were given benefits and others were not. So pay for itself—you know, I have heard Representative Montgomery speak on this issue many times and he is absolutely right, that it really costs nothing. There is no cost in this program.

Obviously, there are some up-front dollars and those are the ones that glare out in a budget session, I am sure. But in the long run this program makes money for the United States, and a lot of other things.

Mr. DASCHLE. Any other comment, Ron?

General WILLIAMSON. Just one comment on the retention side and holding people. If we take a young person—17-year-old—and start over in the training cycle, you won't see that person in the Army or in the unit training in the summer for 2 to 3 years probably. So obviously the fewer times we have to go through that cycle, you take a 17-year-old, you sign him up. They go to their basic training the first summer. So you have lost them as far as trainingwise that first summer. Then they go through the armory. Then the next summer they are at advanced individual training, so you have lost them again. So you are up to the third year before you have them. So, like I said, obviously the fewer times you have to go through that cycle you are making money. That is all there is to it.

Mr. DASCHLE. Phil?

Colonel KILLEY. I just want to reemphasize, I think one of our congressmen made this point, the Reserve component is growing, and growing fairly rapidly, particularly in the next 5 years. And that void of people 18, to 25, is very obvious. We have to compete with those with the active duty, the private business sector, and the institutions of higher learning. In the Reserve and the Guard we can complement each other. We can take those full-time students, and they can be guardsmen as well, so we don't have to compete with this program. We can complement each other, and I think that increases our overall readiness.

Mr. DASCHLE. Let me ask you just a couple of other things and then I will let you all go. There is one thing that was brought up in a hearing I held in South Dakota last year. A complaint registered by a member of the National Guard who said current law required that they graduate from a high school prior to the time they are discharged from active duty in order to be eligible for the New GI Bill.

The bill that is under consideration would change that to allow graduation to occur after discharge. Would that be a benefit, do you think, to any of your recruits? Would it be something that would encourage greater utilization of the GI bill? Have you had any experience with that?

Colonel SYKORA. I am not totally familiar with that proposal. Are you talking about soldiers coming into the Guard directly from active duty? Is that what you are saying?

Mr. DASCHLE. That is right.

Colonel SYKORA. Prior to the time they graduated from high school?

Mr. DASCHLE. Right now the current law requires that he has graduated from high school prior to the time he is discharged from active duty in order to be eligible for the GI bill. Now we are saying in this bill you can graduate following discharge and still be eligible for the GI bill if you so desire.

General WILLIAMSON. If you are on active duty?

Mr. DASCHLE. If you are on active duty. I am wondering if in the Guard there has been any concern expressed about that requirement.

Colonel SYKORA. I have never heard that.

General WILLIAMSON. Ours would probably be different, Congressman. Our situation would probably be different because you could—I think I understand—you could be on active duty, not be a graduate from high school, which would not allow you to participate in the New GI Bill while on active duty, to get ready when you get out to go to college.

Our situation would be in the Guard where that person, we pick them up when they are 17, they probably wouldn't have a problem graduating and participating. In other words, they couldn't participate until they graduated anyway, whereas the active-duty person, if I am understanding it right—or get a GED—couldn't participate in the program because of his high school diploma. So, yes, in answer to your question, I think it would be a help. Not being exactly familiar, but it sounds like it would be a help to that person on active duty.

Mr. DASCHLE. Let me ask one final question in regard to the tools. I firmly believe we need to provide as many opportunities for utilization of the bill as we can as long as they fit the goal that we have set out for what the GI bill is supposed to do, that is, improve recruitment, improve retention, nad improve the overall quality of the people serving in the military.

It seems to me, as mechanically dependent as we are in all branches of the military, having the opportunity to obtain educational opportunities through vocational schools, which are necessarily more mechanically inclined, would serve us well, regardless of whether it's the National Guard or the Active Forces. I would like to have your input on that.

General FRANCE. I would agree wholeheartedly.

Example: The fighter squadron from Colorado went to Vietnam for a year. When we deployed, we of course took a mix of full-time people as well as our weekend guardspeople. The example I have is a engine mechanic. We had a couple of guys who were in a vocational school, here in the Denver metropolitan area, in a jet propul-

sion school, and they were ready to step in immediately when we went into combat, right alongside the people who had been there full time, as opposed to their compatriots who had just trained that one weekend.

It didn't take us very long to get those other people up to speed, but there was a gap. There are many, many skills that the vocational schools provide an excellent background. They complement one another with the military skills that are required and certainly, as has already been stated, that flows out into the civilian community also. I think that is a real good piece of this legislation.

Mr. DASCHLE. Any other comments about that?

General WILLIAMSON. Well, I agree. I like to think of it as an oversight on the part of Congress that they didn't include that when they initially wrote the bill. Very candidly, you probably, as has been pointed out, will have some—the question will be asked over and over again, what does it cost? We can't afford it. We have got the deficit and all that.

Again, in my opinion the benefits outweigh what that is. I think that it can be shown that in the long run, after you get past the initial cost of it, that it can be cost beneficial and I don't think it's fair to say to our young people that you have to go to college in order to participate. There are some people that either for one reason or another don't want to, want to do something else, have abilities that they want to pursue that are different than other people, and, you know, they shouldn't have to participate in this program, go to a college.

To relate it back to South Dakota gain, as you know, we have a lot of people in our rural communities, that's exactly what we need. We need those type of people that can work in their garages, and on Main Street, and on the farm, and so forth, and that is what the vocational education is, what is really going to help them.

In all seriousness, I went around for about the first 3 months pontificating about the new GI bill and recruiting on it, and finally I got stopped because I was telling everybody they could go to voc tech school, and finally my recruiters got me straightened out because I really thought it was a part of the bill. So, yes, I think it should be.

Mr. DASCHLE. I just look at my own educational experience. I can say this because I graduated with a degree in political science, and a background in economics and history. I have to say, if I were a young recruit today, that somebody with a mechanical background in automotive and other kinds of repair, computer science, the broad range of technical, hands-on experience you get at a vocational school, would be far more valuable as a recruit than somebody with a political science degree.

General WILLIAMSON. We would still take you, Congressman.

Mr. DASCHLE. I can learn.

General WILLIAMSON. You are trainable.

Mr. DASCHLE. It's going to take some time. I am a slow learner when it comes to some of this. I think the opportunities that vocational training would offer the Guard, the Reserves and Active Forces are compelling.

Thank you for coming. I have kept you long enough. I appreciate very much your willingness to participate on the panel this afternoon.

General FRANCE. Thank you for the opportunity.

Mr. DASCHLE. Our second panel is comprised of five individuals. We are delighted that you are all here. I think we will start from left to right. We invite you to proceed in any way that you see fit.

We are honored that you could join us this afternoon to give us the benefit of your experience and your insight into this very important issue.

STATEMENTS OF SFC. NORMAN HERBERT HURD, JR., USA; SFC. PAUL JEAN PORTMAN, JR., USA; M. SGT. DWAYNE CATHEY, USAF; T. SGT. CINDY CRAMER, AIR NATIONAL GUARD; SFC. JOHN BYRON HAND, USAR; S.M. SGT. JEANIE V. DOUGLAS, USAFR

Mr. DASCHLE. Who will be first? Sergeant Hurd, do you have a statement?

Sergeant HURD. No, sir, I do not have a statement.

Mr. DASCHLE. Sergeant Portman?

Sergeant PORTMAN. We didn't have anything prepared.

Mr. DASCHLE. You have no prepared statements. All right.

Would you give me first your own personal experience with the GI bill, in a couple of sentences, if you would.

We will start with you. You might introduce yourself, give us a little bit of your background, and then a statement on the GI bill.

STATEMENT OF SFC. NORMAN HERBERT HURD, JR.

Sergeant HURD. My name is Sergeant First Class Norman Hurd. I am an Army recruiter with the Denver Battalion. I have been in the Army 15 years.

I served as an infantry soldier, an Army drill sergeant, an Army recruiter and now a recruiter trainer.

In regards to the GI bill, as a recruiting tool it is a valuable incentive that the recruiters use to attract quality young men and women into our Army.

We find that the quality individual, high mental category individual, who is looking for an opportunity to advance himself, will enlist in the Army for the GI bill because it provides him with a means to continue his education. He can leave his education to join the Army and, once he is finished, go on and complete his educational goals.

The GI bill ties in with the Army's Continuing Education Assistance Program. The individual has a chance to determine mid-range and long-range goals for educational achievements.

I find the Army encourages young men and women to continue their education. As the individual becomes more educated, he becomes a more valuable asset to the Army.

To take away from the program or eliminate the educational incentives would have a drastic effect on the recruiting tools that we have to attract quality young men and women.

Mr. DASCHLE. You don't need any prepared text. You did well without one. You are very articulate.

Thank you, Sergeant Hurd.

Mr. DASCHLE. Sergeant Portman.

STATEMENT OF SGT. PAUL JEAN PORTMAN, JR.

Sergeant PORTMAN. I am Paul Portman. I have been in the Army about 15 years. I have been in the recruiting force since September 1979.

Currently, I work out in Lakewood Recruiting Station as a recruiting commander. The experiences I have had since I have been through both the VEAP and the current GI bill program is basically the competition.

You have competition with scholarships, partially funded scholarships, State grants, and, of course, the parents.

As Mr. Wirth has mentioned earlier about the demographics, the baby boom time is ending. If we are to provide the strength as recruiters, we need to keep something like this New GI Bill around. That competition is keen, and the number one question a recruit will always ask is, "What is in it for me?"

If we can answer that with something of the likes of the New GI Bill, I think we will be able to maintain that strength.

Mr. DASCHLE. Thank you very much, Sergeant Portman.

Mr. DASCHLE. Sergeant Cathey?

STATEMENT OF M. SGT. DWAYNE CATHEY

Sergeant CATHEY. Yes, sir. That is for the invitation, by the way. Enjoyed being here and get a chance to talk for a change.

Mr. DASCHLE. This is something unusual to the profession, I understand.

Sergeant CATHEY. Not necessarily for a recruiter, sir.

I have been in the recruiting service 9 years, now. We have seen a lot of the individuals that come in today as a raining supervisor.

The recruiters coming out question the young people in, "Why are you coming into the Air Force? Why are you looking into it?"

"Education."

There is no real comparison as far as the recruiters that, I see them giving to the young people now, between the GI bill and the VEAP.

Nobody ever came in and asked about the VEAP. Everybody asks about the GI bill. Maybe their dads were Vietnam-era, such as myself, whatever.

When you couple the New GI Bill with the CLEP test that we have at no cost, the year round educational opportunities, because of the salaries, so on and so forth, and throw that all together with community college of the Air Force, it is just real hard to beat.

The wheel is not broke, so I don't think we need to fix it. It is working. Let's leave it the way it is. At least keep it that good and not do away with it.

VEAP didn't work. They didn't participate. I think it is working.

Mr. DASCHLE. Thank you.

Mr. DASCHLE. Sergeant Cramer.

STATEMENT OF T. SGT. CINDY CRAMER

Sergeant CRAMER. I am Sergeant Cramer from the Colorado Air National Guard. I may add, 6 years prior South Dakota Air National Guard.

Mr. DASCHLE. Good for you.

Sergeant CRAMER. I guess the thing—I have been a recruiter just since December. Very, very new. I was a mechanic prior.

The thing I see has an impact on the Guard Reserve—my primary interest, I guess, is the Guard—is that our people are members of the military 2 days a month. The other 28 days of the month they are a member of the civilian community.

This is the first GI bill the Guard Reserve has ever had, and it is kind of working like a college grant system where if maybe you make too much money to qualify for a grant but mom and dad really don't have the money to put you through school, this is your only option.

I really believe that it is probably the deciding factor for about 80 percent of our people, and that is just a guesstimate.

For about 80 percent of our people who come in it is a deciding factor as to whether or not they do the National Guard or the Reserve. They are high school students looking to college.

I would like to see the technical and vocational added. Most of our enlisted jobs—now separating enlisted and officers—most of our enlisted jobs are something that can be trained in a vocational school, therefore, helping the Guard's training and the community training as well.

Mr. DASCHLE. Thank you. Sergeant Hand.

STATEMENT OF SFC. JOHN BYRON HAND

Sergeant HAND. I am Sergeant Hand with the U.S. Army Reserves. I have been recruiting for the Reserves since May 1974. I feel the New GI Bill for Reserves is head and shoulders above the old educational assistance program.

I found the old educational assistance program of limited use. If I had a young man or lady I was trying to recruit into the the Reserves, and if they were quality persons, chances are they had a scholarship or partial scholarship. The only thing we had was reimbursible expenses. If they had a scholarship they had no reimbursible expenses; therefore, I couldn't offer them anything.

The new education assistance in the GI bill, goes above that. Even if they have a scholarship, I can still offer them the money as an incentive to join.

Also, the old program offered a choice of either the bonus, enlistment bonus, $1,500 or $2,000 or educational assistance. The new program offers both to a quality person.

So, it is definitely head and shoulders above the old educational assistance program. I hope we retain it.

Also the changes are nice. I am not so sure the one where they are going to get $35 a month if they go to class 1 night a week is going to make that much difference. As family person, if they get six units, they get $70. If they carry three units, apparently $35. I am not sure that is going to be an inducement, but it will probably help.

Mr. DASCHLE. Thank you.

I am going to have some questions, I think, but I want to finish the panel, Guard.if I could.Last but certainly not least, Sergeant Douglas.

STATEMENT OF S.M. SGT. JEANIE V. DOUGLAS

Sergeant DOUGLAS. Senior Master Sergeant Jeanie Douglas, Senior Recruiter for the Air Force Reserve units based in South and North Dakota, Wyoming, and Colorado, from Denver, Peterson, Colorado Springs and Pueblo, CO.

I have seven recruiters that work with me in recruiting for that region. I have the opportunity to observe the type of people from all those areas to explore why or how this GI bill has affected the recruitment of those people.

Since it initially began last summer, I have statistically analyzed the non-prior service people who entered the Air Force Reserve, through us, anyway; about 90 percent of those people came in with the intention of using the New GI Bill.

So, it has been a significant factor for those people. For the prior service people, a less significant percentage of those people plan on using it; however, some of the reasons they are not is because, it is not available for vocational and technical training, and also, many of them have successfully completed, under the old GI bill, their baccalaureate degrees and wish to continue in graduate work but cannot under the New GI Bill, at least through the Air Force Reserve.

So, if that were a proposed change and it happened, I think that would be a significant value, particularly in the retention of those older people who have prior military service and who now join the Reserve.

They are an invaluable asset to us to begin with, because 9 times out of 10 they are trained. They come to us with a skill, and we definitely need to keep those people.

The incentive of the New GI Bill to continue the graduate work is a major factor.

The only other thing that I have noticed is the chance for those people, because of what was mentioned earlier, the fact these people are full-time involved in their work as a civilian in their job.

They are also citizen soldiers who work part-time for the military. So, some of them are not available to participate in the educational programs on a half-time or full-time basis, but some of them could do so in a lesser amount of invested time.

So, if it were available for them, I think they would also use that.

But without question, the New GI Bill has been a major factor in the ability of my recruiters to more successfully recruit.

Mr. DASCHLE. Two of you have mentioned—I think Sergeant Cramer and Sergeant Douglas have mentioned—that in a vast majority, I think you said "80 percent" or "90 percent" of the cases, the New GI Bill was the incentive for people to join.

Let me see if I understand what you are saying. Are you saying that 80 percent of the people would not have joined were it not for the GI bill?

Sergeant CRAMER. No. It was the deciding factor. They are people sitting there thinking, I am seriously interested in the military, but this way I can do my education and be a member of the military, both.

Mr. DASCHLE. How many panelists would list the GI bill as the prime recruitment device today. Just a show of hands would be fine.

Four. Two of you didn't raise your hand. Which other device is equal to or exceeds the New GI Bill as a recruitment tool?

Sergeant CRAMER. Serving their country, sir.

The past few years has really made a big change since I first came into recruiting back in the 1970's.

Lots of young people come in and say, "I don't care where I am assigned. I don't care what job I do. I just want to serve my country. My father did. My brother did." Whatever.

Secondary, as far as the Air Force is concerned, would be the community college of the Air Force. We offer tuition assistance up to 75 percent paid. That, coupled with the GI bill—now the GI bill, as previously stated, may be the final deciding factor. That is the one that kind of pushes them over the proverbial red line that gets them on our side.

Mr. DASCHLE. What you are saying is that people want to serve their country, but they are also interested in the opportunity to get something; as I think Sergeant Portman said, "What is in it for me?" They want something in return. The GI bill seems to be one of those things most enticing as far as what is in it for them.

Let me ask you this. What do you think the value of extending the GI bill to vocational education would be in terms of the percent of recruits you are seeing now? How much interest is it to what percent of people?

Anybody want to volunteer that?

Sergeant HAND. I think that would affect my recruiting quite a bit, because probably half the young persons I deal with are going on to technical school or out in the civilian work force, and this would probably be a great inducement in my area.

Not all of them are college bound. We would like to encourage them to go to college, but that is not always the case.

Mr. DASCHLE. Are you saying almost half would be interested in vocational education rather than a formal education?

Sergeant HAND. Like the gentleman from South Dakota said, it is too soon to gather statistics on it. People have only been eligible for a couple months on this.

You have to be in the Reserves for 6 months before you are even eligible, but I say a big percentage of the people I am dealing with in Aurora, CO, which is just east of here, are not college bound, so this would be a big inducement.

Mr. DASCHLE. Sergeant Douglas?

Sergeant DOUGLAS. With the computer age upon us, many people are also very interested in that type of skill. In many cases, at least the Air Force Reserve does not offer that, but they want to explore that, particularly in Colorado Springs where it is a high tech industry, and they don't need to go to a 4-year degree and get that in education.

So, in my case, I feel like a healthy 30 percent of the people that we talk to are particularly interested in that and would perhaps utilize it.

Mr. DASCHLE. Thirty percent.

Yes, Sergeant Cramer?

Sergeant CRAMER. I can't state a percentage; however, we have got a school right here in the metro called Colorado Aerotech which has a very, very large impact, at least on the Air National Guard, being right here in Aurora.

So, many people called that are going to that school and saying, "What kind of benefits can you give me, going to the school?"

We can't. We don't have any we can give them other than a job that is similar. And not only would it help their military job, I think, if we got them in the military; it may help them with their college as well, their vocational training.

Mr. DASCHLE. You have been recruiting since 1974.

Sergeant HAND. That is right.

Mr. DASCHLE. Others have been recruiting—one said—Sergeant Cathey, you said 1977.

Sergeant CATHEY. That is right.

Mr. DASCHLE. How do you compare recruiting today, given the GI bill and other factors we have to consider, to what it was in 1974, and 1977, and your first years?

Has there been a positive progression?

Sergeant Cathey.

Sergeant CATHEY. Yes, sir. I feel there has been.

Again, the young people come in, and they have something on their minds besides throwing a rock at you because you are wearing a military uniform like they did a few years back there.

But they seem to be a lot sharper. They are making higher scores on our entrance examinations. They are interested in training, which, back to vocational training, by far is our second most requested what-can-you-do-for-me type of thing, to come into the Air Force.

Education is the first, training is the second. Sounds stupid, I guess, but if your refrigerator is broke, you want somebody who knows something about refrigerators, not a P.E. major, to fix it.

We accredit our vocational training through CCF, so I sure would like to see our GI bill go out to it.

Sergeant HAND. I would like to say the quality of people enlisting today is probably a lot higher than it was back then.

The standards have been raised so much. I strongly agree with this.

As a matter of fact, I wish they would completely eliminate letting us bring people in without a diploma. It is about 10 percent now. I wish they would eliminate it completely.

But the quality has been raised so much. The GI bill is a big inducement.

Mr. DASCHLE. You could meet your requirements with the diploma requirement left out?

Sergeant HAND. I hate to quote the Army. I personally could. I myself could.

Mr. DASCHLE. Yes, Sergeant Cramer?

Sergeant CRAMER. In the Air National Guard, we do require a GED or high school diploma.

Mr. DASCHLE. Sergeant Hurd?

Sergeant HURD. When we look at the quality of the soldiers that we are required to recruit now, the GI bill gives a better incentive to attract those.

During the 1970's I wasn't recruiting, but I was recruited in the 1970's. The emphasis was not necessarily placed on how much you knew, but what drove your train; what was the deciding factor as to whether or not you would go into the military and what military service.

The young men and women that we are recruiting now are more goal-oriented than those individuals recruited during the 1970's.

They are looking more towards long-term planning as opposed to, "What can I do right now to get off the street or to get my feet on the road?"

When we have tools such as the GI bill which shines a light at the end of the tunnel, it makes enlistment or recruitment of those young men and women a lot easier. We can present the features and the results that they can obtain through enlistment in the Army. Before all you had to offer was a little bit of training, a chance to serve your country, and then to go back out and be subjected to all the other heartaches that were left as a result of the Vietnam war.

So, the quality of the young soldier that we are inducing or trying to convince now to enlist in the Army requires us to have the tools to attract him.

If we start taking away from the opportunities and from the benefits of enlistment we are going to, of course, lose those quality young soldiers.

Mr. DASCHLE. Let me ask you one final question.

Do you think the level of advertising and outreach now underway by all branches of service, including the Guard and Reserves, is adequate?

Do you sometimes wish there was more advertising, or are you satisfied?

Yes, Sergeant Douglas?

Sergeant DOUGLAS. I would definitely prefer to see more advertising, highly increased advertising.

Mr. DASCHLE. Highly increased.

Sergeant Hand.

Sergeant HAND. On the Reserve level, it has been inadequate.

Mr. DASCHLE. Sergeant Cramer?

Sergeant CRAMER. We are very, very limited in what we can and cannot pay for. Even if the funding couldn't change it, possibly the rules and the regulations that go along with it could. It would even help.

Mr. DASCHLE. Sergeant Cathey.

Sergeant CATHEY. You always want more of anything, sir, even on recruiting.

Recruiting is going well now. For it to continue to go well, we need that continued emphasis on advertising, the "Hey, we are here if you want us."

Mr. DASCHLE. Sergeant Portman?

Sergeant PORTMAN. Before considering the death of the GI bill, they ought to do away with advertising.

Mr. DASCHLE. In other words, if you have to give something, you had rather have a bill where there is no advertising than some advertising and a bill that is not going to be around.

Sergeant PORTMAN. Right. One of the people that testified earlier had made the comment about the cost being ever-increasing. The cost of education is going up, anyway.

I would personally feel that before my education got cut I would rather have the advertising dollars cut. Let recruiters in the field go out and tell the story.

Mr. DASCHLE. I was referring specifically, of course, to advertising for the GI bill, but your point is well taken.

Sergeant Hurd?

Sergeant HURD. I am in agreement with Sergeant Portman. The Army spent a lot of money in advertising and it has, in fact, netted a great response from the civilian world.

However, I would rather see that money poured in support of the system, or in support of the program to keep the program active and to enable us to spend those dollars attracting more young soldiers, than spend the money for the advertising and watch the bill run down the drain.

Mr. DASCHLE. You have all been tremendous witnesses. You have articulated your positions and your experiences exceedingly well.

I know I speak for the entire Veterans' Affairs Committee and the Congress in extending our sincere gratitude.

We thank you very much.

Mr. DASCHLE. Our third panel is comprised of active duty recruits. Airman Lynette M. Koski, U.S. Air Force; Airman Marie A. Coleman, U.S. Air Force; Pvt. Earl Carter, U.S. Army; Pvt. Wallace Pollard, U.S. Army.

STATEMENTS OF AIRMAN LYNETTE M. KOSKI, U.S. AIR FORCE; AIRMAN MARIE A. COLEMAN, U.S. AIR FORCE; PVT. EARL CARTER, U.S. ARMY; PVT. WALLCE POLLARD, U.S. ARMY

Mr. DASCHLE. Good to see you. It is not every day we have witnesses such as you before the committee. We are very pleased that you can come.

You have heard the recruiters. You have heard the Congressmen. You have heard the Generals. Now it is your time to be heard.

I would really like to hear your experiences. I know you don't have testimony.

I understand two of you are in the program and two of you are not in the program, if I understand my notes correctly.

What I would like you each to do is to give me your own personal background, whether you think this bill is something that would interest you, whether you think it is of any value to your counterparts in the military today, whether you think you would even stay in the military as a result of this, what opportunities does it present.

Just tell me anything that you feel would fit your own personal experience.

Mr. DASCHLE. Airman Koski, we will start with you.

STATEMENT OF AIRMAN LYNETTE M. KOSKI

Airman KOSKI. I am stationed here at Lowry, and I am a personnel clerk. I wasn't interested in the GI bill because of how much it was per month. That is a lot of out of a pay check when you are having a basic.

Another thing that was undesirable about it is you can't get your money back if you decide not to go to college.

When you are right out of high school you don't know if you are going to go to college or not, like I was.

Things to do to change it—I think if you put it over a 24-month period for $50 a month it would be a lot better, and if you have a chance to get it back.

Mr. DASCHLE. If we did that and made it refundable, would you get in it?

Airman KOSKI. Yes, sir.

Mr. DASCHLE. Would you get in it if it were not a vocational program?

Airman KOSKI. Yes, sir.

Mr. DASCHLE. How do you think it would help if you got in it and you decided to stay in the military for a while? Tell me as honestly as you can. Do you think it would have any benefit, any impact, favorably, upon the job you are doing?

Airman KOSKI. Yes, in a way.

Mr. DASCHLE. How?

Airman KOSKI. Like if I took counseling courses that would help with my job, because I work with people, stuff like that.

Mr. DASCHLE. Now, you heard the recruiters. They said that a major percentage of those who came into the military were very interested in the GI bill.

You got into the military, obviously, not directly interested in the GI bill unless it changed.

What was your motivation for getting in?

Airman KOSKI. The area I come from has a very high unemployment rate. It looked like a good opportunity to travel and meet people.

Mr. DASCHLE. From your experiences so far, would you stay in?

Airman KOSKI. Yes, sir.

Mr. DASCHLE. You like it?

Airman KOSKI. Yes.

Mr. DASCHLE. Thank you for coming.

STATEMENT OF AIRMAN MARIE A. COLEMAN

Airman COLEMAN. My name is Airman Coleman. The main reason I came in the military was for the GI bill.

I went to college for about 3 years, and I really couldn't afford it on my own, even with the grants and so forth and so on.

College was constantly going up and up and up. My parents could not afford to help me, so I was basically doing it on my own.

So, that was the main reason why I came in was to further my education and because of the GI bill.

Mr. DASCHLE. Are you participating in the GI bill right now?

62-067 O - 86 - 4

Airman COLEMAN. Yes, I am.

Mr. DASCHLE. And you are contributing $100 a month?

Airman COLEMAN. Yes, I am.

Mr. DASCHLE. I think Airman Koski's point is very well taken about the cost. Is it causing you financial difficulty to make that contribution?

Airman COLEMAN. Well, it basically depends on what you want.

If you want to further your education, of course it is worth it, because eventually, 2 to 1, you will get your degree and stuff like that.

Mr. DASCHLE. Every situation is different, obviously.

Airman COLEMAN. Yes. It is what you want. I want to get my degree.

Mr. DASCHLE. Given the choice of a $50 commitment for 2 years or a $100 commitment for 1 year, which would you choose?

Would you like to extend the agony or get it over with?

Airman COLEMAN. I would like to get it over with, of course, but to me, either way they want I would stick with it, because I want to further my education, get my Bachelor's degree and go on to graduate school.

So, whatever direction they want, I would go with them.

Mr. DASCHLE. If you had the choice when you signed up to take vocational school or to take the more traditional form of education that you are now, would you have chosen vocational school?

Airman COLEMAN. No. I prefer going to a 4-year university.

Mr. DASCHLE. Do you intend to stay in the military?

Airman COLEMAN. For a while, because I have other goals that I have set for myself, but the Air Force will help me obtain my goals.

But I want to move on, as they say.

Mr. DASCHLE. Were you aware of the GI bill prior to the time you signed up?

Airman COLEMAN. Yes. That was the main reason I wanted to further my education, and I couldn't proceed on my own because I was working.

Eventually, I had to go to night school, like two classes a night. If I would have kept on that direction it would have taken me 6 years or more to obtain my 4-year degree. So, I had to do something.

Mr. DASCHLE. Was your recruiter well versed in the GI bill as it affected you?

Airman COLEMAN. Well, he couldn't tell me that much, but he informed me as much as he could.

When I went to basic training, that is when they went into the details of it.

Mr. DASCHLE. How many of your colleagues in the military right now, your level of experience, are currently utilizing the GI bill?

Is it a rare phenomenon or is it something that is becoming more prevalent?

Airman COLEMAN. When I came in—of course, people are taking advantage of it now—but the ones that were prior to me, like 1 or 2 years before me, they are not really involved in the GI bill because they say it costs too much; $50, $100 a month is too much.

They can't afford it. So, I tell them, it is what you want to do, basically.

Mr. DASCHLE. Well, you are going to be graduating with a degree in what?

Airman COLEMAN. Business Administration, hopefully.

Mr. DASCHLE. Sounds like you are well on your way. I congratulate you.

Airman COLEMAN. Thank you, sir.

Mr. DASCHLE. Private Carter.

STATEMENT OF PVT. EARL CARTER

Private CARTER. I am Private Earl Carter. I am in the GI bill, and I didn't really join the service because of that. It wasn't my main goal in joining the service.

My main reason for joining the service was because of the prestige and the respect that a lot of service members receive.

I joined the GI bill, though, because I know personally myself, I am not too great at handling money and the GI bill forces me to put away that money, and forces me to deal with that.

Mr. DASCHLE. You are currently enrolled in the GI bill, are you not?

Private CARTER. Yes, sir.

Mr. DASCHLE. What are you enrolled in? What is your major going to be?

Private CARTER. I am not going to school right now. I started this semester, and I wanted to go in psychology. The cost for that—I looked at it about a month later, and it was astronomical, so I left it and decided I would—

Mr. DASCHLE. You anticipate utilizing your GI bill at a later date?

Private CARTER. I hope to, sir. I hope to.

Mr. DASCHLE. Among those that came in with you, is the GI bill looked upon as something that is nice but not practical, is a fairly popular opportunity for educational advancement?

How is it viewed? Is it this nice little thing on the shelf that everybody sees up there, but walks by? Does it have the kind of practical impact that we in the Congress think it probably has?

What I want to get from you—and I think I have gotten a fairly good perception so far—how is it viewed?

Don't give me what you think I want to hear. Tell me what you really think the GI bill is today to men and women coming into the service.

Private CARTER. You are right. It is sort of like a thing on the shelf to a certain degree. But the soldiers act more like compulsive buyers.

They see it and they grab it because it is there. It is not necessarily because they are going to use it. It is because it looks good to this person or looks good to that person, and therefore, they take it and it really doesn't mean a lot to them.

That is my personal opinion. I know many of my friends who did the same thing, who don't intend to use it at all, and I know some who didn't even look at it, just didn't want to buy it.

Personally, I feel a lot of them are doing it because the next guy is doing it, or because mom and dad saw it and said, "Why don't you do this, and it will help us a lot and help you a lot to go to college."

That is my personal opinion.

Mr. DASCHLE. Do you think this commitment of $100 a month or $50 a month deters the frivolous use of the program?

Private CARTER. For some. For some it does. For me, being in the Army, there is not a lot of expenses I have, so therefore, $100 out of my paycheck wouldn't hurt.

Fifty dollars would be better, though, for 2 years. There is no doubt about that.

I don't see any problem with $100 a month.

Mr. DASCHLE. When did you graduate from high school?

Private CARTER. I graduated in May of 1985.

Mr. DASCHLE. May of 1985, so just 1 year ago.

Private CARTER. That is right.

Mr. DASCHLE. And your plans, let's say, for the next 2 or 3 years are what?

Private CARTER. Finish out my 3-year term.

Mr. DASCHLE. Have you given any thought to staying in the military?

Private CARTER. No, I haven't. As soon as I finish, I am gone. Two seconds.

The educational aspects of the military are great, but only if you get in the right—the right job.

My idea is I really like the educational benefits. It has a lot of correspondence courses, a lot of college courses you can take while you are being a soldier, but unless you get into the right job line you can't do that.

Mr. DASCHLE. What is your post?

Private CARTER. I am a tanker, sir. So, we spend so much time in the field, for me to pursue something I want, I don't have enough time to do that.

A lot of people are coming in knowing of these opportunities but not realizing that the job that they choose will hinder this opportunity.

I think that is something the recruiters need to let the recruitee know so they can get the right job line for them.

Mr. DASCHLE. I appreciate your candor and your direct response to my questions.

Mr. DASCHLE. Private Pollard.

STATEMENT OF PVT. WALLACE POLLARD

Private POLLARD. I am Private Pollard. My post is general electronic communication, and I am not in the GI bill because I am pursuing the military as a career. That is basically why I didn't take the GI bill.

Mr. DASCHLE. Was it offered to you when you signed up?

Private POLLARD. Yes, it was.

Mr. DASCHLE. At that time, you chose not to use it?

Private POLLARD. I didn't find it valuable to me, if I am serving in the military as a career.

Mr. DASCHLE. Would you anticipate whenever you retire from the military using your GI bill benefits if they were offered to you at that time?

Private POLLARD. Yes, sir, I would.

Mr. DASCHLE. But that is sort of secondary to whatever other considerations you have in the military?

Private POLLARD. It is far away from now. Twenty years in the military, I can get a lot of college education through the military.

Mr. DASCHLE. When did you graduate?

Private POLLARD. June of 1985.

Mr. DASCHLE. June of 1985. And you have made an initial commitment for 3 years.

Private POLLARD. Four years.

Mr. DASCHLE. You have already decided you are going to reup?

Private POLLARD. Reup, yes, sir.

Mr. DASCHLE. What percent of your associates, the new recruits, do you think will use the GI bill during their 3- or 4-year period?

Private POLLARD. I am not particularly sure how many will use it, but a lot have come in because of the GI bill.

Mr. DASCHLE. A lot of them do?

Private POLLARD. Come in because of the GI bill.

Mr. DASCHLE. What is a lot, in your opinion?

Private POLLARD. When I was at Fort Gordon in Georgia, basically 90 percent came in because of the GI bill.

Mr. DASCHLE. Ninety percent of the recruits.

Private POLLARD. Most of the people I talk to. They intend to go to college after the military. But then there are some right now, they are not sure if they want to attend college.

They might pursue the military as a career also, because the communications field in the military is going places. It will go places. It is a good field to be in.

Mr. DASCHLE. Well, I want to thank you all for your participation. The recruiters, as you heard, had indicated that the quality of the recruits has improved dramatically since the time—they said 15 years ago, which was about the time I was recruited. I could substantiate that, having heard the view.

I thank you very much.

Any last comments from anybody?

You are excused.

Mr. DASCHLE. Our final panel is comprised of some senior noncommissioned officers.

STATEMENTS OF SFC. CLAUDE WILKERSON, U.S. ARMY; M. SGT. PHILIP NOE, U.S. AIR FORCE; M. SGT. VERNON K. CROW; C.M. SGT. GURNEY ULRICH, AIR NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. DASCHLE. Thank you, gentlemen, for joining us this afternoon. You have had to wait to make your presentations, but I found this extremely enlightening, and I know I won't be disappointed by your comments as well.

We will proceed in much the same way. I know you don't have written statements. Sergeant Wilkerson, give me an account of your experience, and opinion of the value you see with the GI bill. What kind of a retention tool do you think it is?

What do you see of the recruits, whether the last panel is a representative panel or not?

I am going to withhold my questions, I think, until all four of you have made your initial comments.

So, we will begin with you.

STATEMENT OF SFC. CLAUDE WILKERSON

Sergeant WILKERSON. I am Sergeant Claude Wilkerson. I am stationed at Fort Carson, CO.

As far as schooling goes, I have always used tuition assistance and found it to be very economical for what I need.

The troops coming in, from what I see, are very excited about the New GI Bill. I have got a few that are getting out of the military now and are very excited about going to college. They just don't have enough good to say about it.

I really think it is a good tool to keep. We shouldn't do away with it.

Mr. DASCHLE. Thank you.

Sergeant Noe.

STATEMENT OF M. SGT. PHILIP NOE

Sergeant NOE. Good afternoon, sir.

The New GI Bill, I have found the recruits coming in now are very high on the New GI Bill as a recruitment tool, has been very applicable .

I myself am under the Vietnam-era GI bill. For me, when I joined the military, the GI bill was a major selling point. I have individuals working for me under the VEAP, and that is very much less a selling point than either of the other two GI bills.

The New GI Bill gives them an opportunity missing under the old GI bill, and the New GI Bill, going to transfer over the old benefits to the New GI Bill—I have a particular interest in the New GI Bill.

Several years ago, I had to go through—before the New GI Bill came out—I had to make a decision if I was going to stay in the military or not.

With my old GI bill benefits running out in 1989, I had a decision to make, and with the introduction of the new bill, I no longer have that decision.

Now I can keep those benefits and use them after I retire from the military.

Mr. DASCHLE. Sergeant Crow?

STATEMENT OF M. SGT. VERNON K. CROW

Sergeant CROW. Thank you, sir.

I am a recruiter supervisor for the Colorado Army National Guard. You have heard from the recruiters. I am going to relay a little bit from the other side of working out in the field and the feedback I get from recruiters and the applicants, because I have an opportunity to be in the schools teaching career planning workshops.

I also have an opportunity to be at the units working with the unit administrators and first sergeants and so forth.

One of the areas that I work with is ROTC at CSU, CU, the School of Mines and also downtown Denver at Metro. In the last few months we have started gaining new people in the ROTC simultaneous membership program, largely because of the GI bill.

With the old cash incentive programs we had, the educational assistance programs were all terminated when young people contracted into the simultaneous membership program.

The New GI Bill does not terminate. It allows them to continue working towards their education while in the dual assignment with the National Guard and the ROTC. This has opened new doors for us with the ROTC elements and getting that first and second year student in college.

Now, why do I say this? Because we are now seeing that these people should have that 180 days out of the way. We are not looking at the third year ROTC person as we were. We are backing up and picking up the younger student. They are starting to take an earlier look at the military program.

Also, I would like to speak to an area of recruiting we call non-prior service individuals. The Colorado National Guard has been very low in the non-prior categories up until this last—little over 1 year.

We were sitting at about an 18-percent enlistment rate of non-prior service. Now, we are hitting 35 percent and above. Our goal this year is 40 percent, non-prior service people.

I will explain why we want these in just a few minutes. By moving from 18 to 35 percent, we are now attracting juniors in high school rather than high school seniors and graduates.

This being the case, they can do their basic training 1 summer and their advanced training the following summer, complete their 180-days and now qualify for the GI bill at the beginning of their first college year.

Otherwise, they would have to wait for a period of time, losing a semester or even two semesters of school before they were eligible for the GI bill, to start getting payment on it.

So, we are starting to see a very definite increase in these type of people. This type of person also helps us on the retention side of the house.

I have worked retention, as well. On the retention side of the house, Colorado Guard, we are seventh. We are seventh in recruiting. We are also seventh in retention, but it happens to be at the bottom end.

We are losing 30 percent, or have been. It was higher than that. We are lowering that. By getting students that are juniors, seniors, and graduates in lower college levels, we can keep them for longer periods of time.

We are also seeing 6-year reenlistments rather than the 1-year or 3-year reenlistments because of the New GI Bill.

My last reenlistment, even an old guy like myself—I might say education is important to us sergeants that are still out in the field—I just completed my Associates Degree. I was not able to use the GI bill. I did not have it under any program, because I had 20 years with the National Guard.

I now can use the GI bill for the remainder of my education if I want it. I think that is an excellent program, and I definitely would like to see the Vo. Techs added.

This is an area we need some help on. We have some excellent schools that are VA approved in this area that we cannot tap at this particular point.

Mr. DASCHLE. Well, Sergeant Crow, that was a very helpful insight into the value of the bill, especially to the Colorado National Guard.

I am amazed. Why would your retention be so dramatically different than South Dakota's? I said South Dakota's because—

Sergeant CROW. We would like to have that answer, sir. We are working on that. We have at least slowed it down somewhat.

But I think one of the keys is South Dakota has been enlisting the young troop for many, many years.

Colorado has not. We have been enlisting the prior service person. We have not been into the schools. In the last few years since I have been a supervisor this is one of the areas that I have been keen on, and it has been paying off.

Mr. DASCHLE. Glad to hear it.

Sergeant Ulrich.

STATEMENT OF C.M. SGT. GURNEY ULRICH

Sergeant ULRICH. Yes, sir.

I think that the New GI Bill—basically, we will say, all the GI bills have proven invaluable to the United States of America. There are people who will be voting on this bill who undoubtedly would not have the education they do if it had not been for the GI bill.

It is imperative for recruiting. We need an inducement. We live in a very competitive society and we must compete with that society.

The caliber of people in the service nowadays, the new recruits, is amazing to the caliber of people that I first went into the service with.

Mr. DASCHLE. You think there is that much of a contrast?

Sergeant ULRICH. Yes, sir. Yes, sir.

It was not uncommon at the time I went in, very few people even had a high school diploma. In fact, most of us were motivated by the military to get a high school diploma and then went on to college on the GI bill, we will say from my time—it was the Korean War era—in vocational schools and things of that nature.

We were motivated by the military to become educated. It is wonderful if we can continue that motivation. There is a price tag on the GI bill, but the rewards can be priceless. If we could produce one Jonas Salk we would pay for everything we have invested in the GI bill.

There are a lot of people out there who desire to have an education but in many ways cannot get it because of the price tag on universities and things of this nature.

I myself would never have been able to afford to go to college. My parents certainly could not have sent me to college or things of this nature.

It is imperative we do it, because the entire country does benefit from it. If we get the person in the service—and that person may spend 20 years in the service or he may spend 25—but when he leaves we will have produced a better American, a better human being and more productive human being.

So, to me, it is priceless.

Mr. DASCHLE. I couldn't agree with you more.

One of the things that is included in the revisions and additions to the GI bill that we are now contemplating is the opportunity for flight training.

As you know, flight training was included at one time. It was dropped. It was dropped because of abuse in the program and some skepticism about whether flight training has any merit to it.

Have any of you had any experience with flight training or the need for flight training or have any opinions as to whether the addition of flight training would be helpful or not?

Sergeant ULRICH. I can't honestly say, sir.

Sergeant NOE. Sir, I have known individuals under the old program who actually had flight training before it was eliminated.

As far as the advancement of their education and making them better person, I don't really think that it necessarily did that.

It did, however, give them the opportunity to go on to different career opportunities, to work for different small airlines and that type of thing.

So, in that light, it is a good benefit. In the light of strictly education, it is not.

Mr. DASCHLE. As a recruitment tool, I suppose it would be helpful just as one other little tool in the tool box.

Sergeant ULRICH. Yes.

Mr. DASCHLE. We have done a lot of comparing this afternoon between what it is like now and what it was like 15, 20 years ago. Fifteen or 20 years ago, of course, we had the Vietnam war. We had during the Vietnam war, all kinds of opportunities for people to obtain educational assistance, that certainly had to have undermined recruitment.

Is it possible to fairly compare this period with a period 15 or 20 years ago, both recruitment and retention?

I guess I would ask, pending your answer to that question, what would be a fair comparison, should we have another situation similar to Vietnam at some point in the future?

Could we anticipate recruitment and retention, again, to be a very serious challenge, and would the GI bill in some way augment that recruitment to the extent that it wouldn't be the problem it was back 20 years ago?

Sergeant CROW. I can't answer that totally, but I can answer this, that being from Boulder, CO, and from the CU campus and knowing when you could and when you could not wear your uniform, and, totally, the ROTC's didn't even wear their uniforms on campus, those eras are gone, hopefully, forever, and hopefully we never come back to them.

I wear this uniform proudly, and I hope that everyone else wears their uniform in the same manner.

The tools that we have, the GI bill is only one of them. I don't use all my tools in my tool box, but some day I might, and that is what we have to make available.

Sergeant ULRICH. I have been meditating. It is difficult, because up until the Vietnam-era we always had the incentive of a draft, for the most part.

How much that motivated people, it would be hard to understand. I spent an awful lot of years as a drill instructor in the service, and we had an awful lot of people coming and going, and it would be hard to imagine what the incentive was.

I know what the incentive was for my generation. It was clear-cut. Once you eliminate the draft, the entire picture changed. Like I say, we have become a very competitive society, and we must compete with that society.

It is not the military that it once was. The education level is extremely high compared to what it was many years ago. It is highly technical, very complex. It requires, in many ways, the dedication of a monk at times.

People will develop a love for it, but we have to have the incentive to get the people in that will develop that love for it.

Some will; some won't. That is what makes it go around. It is a cross section of our society and always has been. That has been the strength of it, because it is a cross section.

Mr. DASCHLE. Any other comments?

One of the panel talked about the increasing need for education as you look at the tremendous changes that have occurred in the military.

In the time that I was in the Air Force, from 1969 to 1973, and the time that I have served in the Congress, I have seen a dramatic increase in our reliance on sophisticated equipment, from computers to aircraft to armaments of all kinds.

I think it would be a real fallacy for this country not to understand that there is an equal need for sophistication within our personnel.

Just as we probably couldn't get along with an F-86 or an F-100 any more or whatever tanks we used during World War II, we probably can't get along any longer with high school deficient personnel or even, for that matter, with high school graduate personnel, in some cases.

Whether or not we are willing to recognize that need for advanced education is determined, in part, by whether or not we recognize the need for the New GI Bill.

There is an incredible amount of experience in front of me this afternoon. I can't even imagine the number of years of experience that I have right at this table and the changes that you have seen.

Obviously, from experience comes a certain wisdom and from that wisdom I hear you loud and clear.

The need for the GI bill is there, is perhaps as pronounced as it has ever been, and certainly as we consider the incredible demands put upon our military forces, including Guard and Reserve, as well as the active duty personnel, the need for education is paramount.

I am very grateful to you for making the climax of this very interesting hearing such a productive one.

Any other comments?

Sergeant Noe?

Sergeant NOE. Yes, sir. The previous panel had four airmen and soldiers. None of them seem to have been married.

When I came in the military back in 1973 and was immediately married, $100 a month would have been a prime amount of money out of my pay. It was lucky to have a dollar from payday to payday.

Under the current system of $100 a month, it would almost be impossible for a married airman or soldier to be able to afford that.

Fifty dollars might be too much until they have a chance to make a little more rank, or they can actually afford any type of deduction.

Fifty dollars a month for married individuals is often too much. If that could be deferred to a later point instead of immediately upon entering the military, that would be of great help to a lot of these individuals.

It would definitely increase the number of individuals who would later get into the program, I feel, but it would leave that avenue open to them.

Also, for those individuals who have not already signed up—I am not sure how the bill works in that light, but if you are going to change the $50 deduction, will that be retroactive, is the question I have, for those people who have not already taken advantage of it because they could not afford the $100 a month?

I see that as a prime item that needs to be looked at.

Mr. DASCHLE. Excellent suggestion, Sergeant Noe.

Sergeant NOE. Thank you, sir.

Mr. DASCHLE. Thank you very much for coming this afternoon. We are grateful to you.

That being the last panel, I want to thank all of our participants this afternoon. For those who have come to listen, I think you are like me; you have learned a great deal.

The comments and the tremendous information provided has been extremely helpful to us. Your comments will be instrumental in guiding this committee, particularly this subcommittee, in making some decisions about the New GI Bill in the very near future.

To all of you, my sincere thanks. I know I am speaking for all members of this subcommittee as well as the chairman of the full committee.

With that, the hearing stands adjourned.

Whereupon, at 3:45 p.m., the subcommittee was adjourned subject to the call of the Chair.]

APPENDIX

PATRICIA SCHROEDER
1st District, Colorado
Washington Office:
2410 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
(202) 225-4431
District Office:
1823 Stout Street
Denver, CO 80202
(303) 844-3100

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE
POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE
JUDICIARY COMMITTEE
SELECT COMMITTEE ON CHILDREN, YOUTH AND FAMILIES
CONGRESSIONAL CAUCUS FOR WOMEN'S ISSUES, CO-CHAIR

STATEMENT BY U.S. REP. PATRICIA SCHROEDER
before the
EDUCATION, TRAINING, and EMPLOYMENT SUBCOMMITTEE
of the
HOUSE VETERANS AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
Denver, Colorado
May 27, 1986

Mr. Chairman, let me welcome you to Denver, Colorado and commend you for holding hearings here on the current issues revolving around the G.I. Bill.

Denver was a wise choice for these hearings because it is a regional headquarters for the Veterans Administration and because of the educational opportunities found statewide. Colorado has 14 state colleges and universities, 11 community colleges, and 7 local district colleges. This does not include the many technical, trade, and vocational training institutes that veterans are also eligible to enter upon completion of their military service.

One particular program run by Denver's Metropolitan State College is specifically for veterans' education. Veterans Upward Bound helps vets finish high school and continue on through college. The program's existence and success proves that a high population of vets with educational inclinations can be found here.

THIS STATIONERY PRINTED ON PAPER MADE WITH RECYCLED FIBERS

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Today's hearing will no doubt examine the proposal to end the All-Volunteer Force Educational Assistance, the New G.I. Bill, passed by Congress in 1984. This new law encourages peacetime recruitment by providing expanded educational benefits for enlistees from July, 1985 to July, 1988 as well as for certain Reservists.

This proposal has caused much Washington warfare lately. The fighting includes secret alliances, leaked memos, and other guerrilla tactics Washington insiders wage so well. Your decision to determine the value of the G.I Bill from recipients and providers outside of Washington is wise.

While not on the Veterans Committee, I do sit on the Armed Services Committee, which does play a part in this debate. I have never supported the high tech, big ticket weapons our committee always finds so appealing. I reserve my support for the people aspects of the military. Military pay, housing, family support services, and post-career benefits are what maintains this country's best and basic weapon- the soldier, sailor, and pilot.

That's why I give you encouragement today in your pursuit of top notch educational benefits to those Americans who deserve this country's appreciation.

BIBLIOTECA YALE 238

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20515

STATEMENT OF REP. TIMOTHY E. WIRTH

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS AFFAIRS

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT

MAY 27, 1986

Mr. Chairman, let me open by expressing my appreciation to you and Mr. McEwen for holding this hearing in Denver. The GI Bill is of critical importance to the soldiers and veterans of Colorado and the Nation. I am hopeful that today's hearing will encourage the Administration to retract its ill-advised proposal to eliminate this vital recruitment and education program.

Mr. Chairman, let me be frank. The primary reason why we should support the new and improved GI Bill is to strengthen our national defense. We need top quality recruits to maintain and upgrade the caliber of America's armed forces.

It doesn't take a demographer to see that we are going to need powerful incentives if we are going to attract an adequate share of our country's qualified young men and women into the military services. This is especially the case in a time when the economic demand for talented young people is high and when America's military organization and weaponry require more sophisticated skills.

What has proven to be one of the best incentives for attracting quality recruits is the promise of education -- the promise of a rewarding college or vocational training experience. That's where the new GI Bill has come in, with its innovative mix of income set-asides and government assistance to meet the costs of a recruit's college education. Because of the GI Bill, thousands of bright young Americans are making a positive decision to join America's armed services -- a choice they might not have made without the availability of this program.

With the advent of the new GI Bill, the Army has seen a substantial increase in the number and quality of its recruits. One Army spokesman told the VA Committee last year that the Army enlisted 17 percent more highly qualified young men in the first quarter of the new GI Bill than it did in Fiscal Year 1984 under the old Veterans Educational Assistance Program (VEAP).

The Air Force reports a 38 percent participation rate under the GI Bill, as opposed to 6 percent under VEAP. Air Force officers have also noted that the GI Bill is attracting a steady stream of excellent recruits, the type that are needed to meet their high technology requirements.

Mr. Chairman, I could spend the rest of the afternoon listing the new GI Bill's recruiting achievements. Instead, let me just say that, I believe that we would do our country a grave disservice by ending this remarkable experiment after less than one year.

That is why I question the Administration's rationale for proposing to shut down the GI Bill and return to VEAP. The Administration claims that such a shift will save money and maintain a reasonable level of incentives for recruits.

I strongly disagree. We may be saving some dollars but at tremendous cost to our defenses. The Army, the Navy and the Air Force all agree that a return to VEAP would severely damage their abilities to recruit top quality men and women. Army Secretary John Marsh put it best when he told Secretary Weinberger that, "Termination of the new GI Bill will take from the Army an important and efficient tool in the recruiting of a quality active and reserve force."

Mr. Chairman, that is a serious warning from one who is concerned with the maintenance of a strong national defense force. I stand with Secretary Marsh, with you and Chairman Montgomery in opposing the Administration's short-sighted effort to dismantle the carefully crafted new GI Bill. We should permit the program to run its three-year course, refining it as we go along to deal with unforeseen contingencies.

With the introduction of H.R. 3747, you are clearly taking that approach, Mr. Chairman, and I salute your efforts. H.R. 3747 is a prudent measure, designed to allow individuals using the GI Bill to pursue on-the-job and apprenticeship training. By enhancing the educational incentives available under the GI Bill, your bill truly reflects the broader purpose of this important legislation. I look forward to supporting it when it comes to the House floor, and to continuing our work together to maintain and strenghthen the education and employment programs for our veterans, active forces and reserves.

Thank you again for the opportunity to testify today.

MAJOR GENERAL RONALD F. WILLIAMSON

THE ADJUTANT GENERAL

SOUTH DAKOTA NATIONAL GUARD

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, TRAINING, AND EMPLOYMENT

MAY 27, 1986

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I am pleased to be able to testify on the Veterans Educational Assistance Act of 1984 - - The new GI Bill and follow on legislation such as HR 3747, amended, the "Veterans Education Amendments of 1986".

The key to maintaining the voluntary nature of our "all volunteer military," is to see that we make military service rewarding enough that we continue to attract highly qualified and dedicated personnel. The South Dakota Army National Guard has been able to maintain the highest readiness standards and has won almost every award available for battalion and company readiness. The 2nd Battalion 147th Field Artillery, headquartered in Webster, South Dakota, won the Kerwin Trophy for three consecutive years. Being singled out as the most outstanding Army National Guard Battalion in the United States was made possible through dedication of citizen soldiers and judicious use of incentive programs like the GI Bill. South Dakota is fourth in the Nation for meeting its fiscal year recruiting and retention missions. We are currently at 108% of authorized strength and 102% of our required wartime strength. Over the last two years, financial conditions in South Dakota, an agricultural State, have become increasingly more difficult. Every week, more farmers are selling out or going bankrupt, stores are closing, unemployment is rising, and education costs are going up. Our retention has improved 30% since

this time last year and we believe the GI Bill entitlement is an absolutely critical element in this success story.

Nation wide, one out of every five hundred twenty-three people (1:523) belongs to the Army National Guard. In South Dakota, one out of every one hundred sixty-four (1:164) belongs to the Army National Guard and in some of the small rural Guard communities the ratio is better. In the smaller communities, if you are not in the Army National Guard, you probably can not afford to go to college. The South Dakota Army National Guard has approximately 4,200 members eligible for the program. Even though the program is relatively new, having been implemented on July 1, 1985 and regulations require 180 days of membership prior to enrollment, South Dakota Army Guard already has 300 plus soldiers enrolled. As of March 31, 1986, South Dakota ranked fourth in the Nation in percentage of Army National Guard soldiers participating in the GI Bill program. With more than 5% of the total South Dakota Army National Guard membership participating, the GI Bill program is significant.

The GI Bill should not only be continued; it should be expanded! Right now, a student can qualify for the GI Bill by taking a vocational type course in college while similar courses cannot be supported in non-college (Vocational Technical) schools. Society demands trained service people in all areas of our way of life. The automotive technician (which has become very "high tech" during our computer age), refrigeration/air conditioning experts, food service personnel, diesel mechanics, etc., all have as big a part to play in life as the teachers, engineers, computer analysts, bankers, and business people. Again, the GI Bill is key to attracting specialists like these and expansion of the program to apprenticeship, on the job training, and flight training is urgently needed.

Lieutenant General Emmett Walker, Chief of the National Guard Bureau, stood before this subcommittee on November 21, 1985, and said that "as equipment and doctrine become more complex and the use of higher technology become more prevalent, we will be able to retain and recruit more of these highly skilled, motivated, and capable people with the new GI Bill." And, when talking of the critical need of meeting continued growth requirements necessary for maintaining and improving readiness, General Walker also said, "as we look to an aggregate end strength growth for the Army and Air National Guard of 28,000 by Fiscal Year 1987 and continued growth through Fiscal Year 1990 in the face of a dwindling manpower pool and competing civilian employment opportunities, we must have the tools to man our force." The South Dakota Army National Guard agrees with General Walker, and we hope you understand our needs and will support the continuation and expansion of the entitlement, to include allowing attendance at technical and vocational schools. We respectfully urge expansion of the entitlements and continued appropriations.

Before closing, I need to address the importance of continuation of incentive programs such as enlistment and reenlistment bonuses, even with continuation of the GI Bill. As an entitlement, the GI Bill Program is available to all Guardsmen (except those doing graduate work and we believe that too should be changed). Incentive programs are different in that they are targeted towards individuals in certain categories; enlistees, reenlistees, and individuals in selected Military Occupational Specialties are examples. Incentive programs are particularly important because they offer something to those who do not go to college and therefore, they should be continued. Tied closely with the GI Bill and incentive programs is the issue of the draft; we believe that without these important programs, the Nation could soon be facing the draft.

I thank you for your time, concern, and interest in this very important and cost effective piece of legislation.

Prepared Statement of Col. Philip G. Killey, Commander, South Dakota Army National Guard

Retaining the New GI Bill (NGIB) is a vital ingredient for manning the National Guard in the next decade, particularly since the Guard and Reserve have become critical to the success of our Total Force. The Army and Air National Guard are scheduled to grow dramatically between now and 1991. For the Army Guard, this is an increase from 460,000 currently to 499,000 and perhaps as much as 513,000. The Air Guard is scheduled to grow from 110,000 now to 120,000 by 1990.

During this period of projected rapid growth, there will be a declining number of 18 - 25 age men and women as a result of the baby bust of 20 years ago. The competition for those within this group not only is among the various services and the private business sector, but also with the institutions of higher education. Colleges and universities are competing in this talent pool for students while the military services are seeking them as enlistees. There simply are insufficient numbers of high school graduates in the pipelines to adequately fill the demands of these competing institutions.

That is a primary reason why retention of the NGIB, particularly for the Guard and Reserve, is so important. Both the education establishment and the military establishment can utilize the same talent pool, particularly in the Guard and Reserve where military services and higher education can be undertaken simultaneously.

The decision to terminate the NGIB could have a wide-spread negative impact on the Air National Guard Recruiting and Retention efforts. Nationally, as of 30 Nov 85, the ANG has 4,651 members who have either enlisted or reenlisted for six years to become eligible for NGIB entitlements. This represents 75% of the enlistments/reenlistments during the first five months of the program.

In the 114th Tactical Fighter Group, South Dakota Air National Guard since the enactment of the NGIB until 22 May 86 we have enlisted 96 new members into the unit of which 71 (approximately 75%) have elected to use the NGIB. Unlike the active forces, the ANG does not have a Veteran Educational Assistance Program to fall back on. When the NGIB went into effect on 1 July 1985, the Educational Assistance Bonus was terminated. The end result, should the NGIB be terminated, would be a major force without one of its largest enlistment/retention inducements.

The impact of the NGIB has been to draw more people into the ANG in addition to encouraging members already on board to commit to service in the ANG an additional six years. To eliminate this force management tool is to reduce the capability of the ANG to meet end strength goals for the next five years of projected growth. This becomes critical in light of a projected ANG end strength increase of 4,000 personnel each year for FY 87 and 88.

Retention of qualified members has been a number one priority with the National Guard. The NGIB has been a driving force in the retention of our experienced members. Elimination of the NGIB reduces our ability to stabilize the critical mid-career pool of members where experience is concentrated and future leaders are cultivated. Prior to the implementation of the NGIB the retention rate of the 114 TFG's first term airmen was 42%. The current retention rate of first term airmen has made a steady climb to the present amazing rate of 96%.

As a full partner in today's Total Air Force, the Air National Guard must enlist and retain quality, well educated people in order to operate and maintain our technically superior and advanced modern equipment. Retention of highly qualified, experienced people keeps the Air National Guard at a higher state of readiness and provides a cost savings of continually replacing and retraining new members into the force.

Finally, the "on again, off again" condition that would arise from the early termination of the NGIB will generate a lack of confidence in the ANG programs on the part of our members. This would be especially true if these members were operating on a good faith understanding that 30 June 1988 would be the earliest date the entitlement might be cancelled.

Because of these drawbacks, we recommend continuation of the NGIB at least until the end of the previously advertised test period of 30 Jun 88.

CONGRESSMAN DAN SCHAEFER
Statement for the Record

HOUSE VETERANS' AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT

Field Hearing
Tuesday, May 27, 1986
Denver, Colorado

I wish to welcome my colleague, Mr. Daschle, to the beautiful state of Colorado. It is a pleasure to have you here. I hope that, after even a short visit, you will understand why so many refer to Colorado as "God's country."

I also wish to thank you for choosing Colorado as the sight for this field hearing, since we have a substantial military presence in our state. Many veterans stay in Colorado, or return here after their service, because it is a very pleasant place to live. Your being here today demonstrates that. My constituency, Colorado's Sixth District, has a very large percentage of veterans, many of whom are recipients of military education benefits.

It is not necessary for me to reiterate how important veteran's educational benefits are. I know a lot of recruits who enlisted, in part, because of the G.I. Bill, and many others who would never have had the opportunity of higher education without it. It is a program that should continue.

I commend you for reviewing the G.I. Bill, and for considering legislation to continue this program within current budget restraints. I know what Gramm-Rudman has done to new spending proposals, so I offer you my encouragement in redesigning the program to operate successfully, service our veterans, and stay within reasonable spending limits.

Again, welcome to Denver and to Colorado. Previous commitments have kept me from being here personally, but having the Subcommittee here is an honor. Thank you for your time and interest.

With respect,

Dan Schaefer

BIOGRAPHICAL BACKGROUND

NAME:	Carter, Earl Jr.
SSN:	214-80-6419
UNIT:	CO C 1/77 Armor Ft Carson, CO
DOB:	January 19, 1967
BIRTHPLACE:	Minneapolis MN
EDUCATION:	Henry Sibley High School, West St Paul, MN University of Minnesota (1 Semester)
MILITARY HISTORY:	Entered Active Duty 11 January 1986

BIOGRAPHICAL BACKGROUND

NAME: ARTHUR DWAYNE CATHEY, MASTER Sergeant, USAF

BIRTH PLACE & DATE: Shawnee, Oklahoma, 27 Sep 1950

AREA OF CHILDHOOD: Seminole, Oklahoma

EDUCATION: High School - Seminole H.S.

Additional Education: Associate Degree, Community College of the Air Force

MARITAL STATUS: Married (Wife - Katherine/two sons - Bret and Brian)

MILITARY BACKGROUND:

Enlisted: Feb 1969

Assignments:

BMTS -	Lackland AFB, TX
Technical School -	Lowry AFB, CO
Jul/69-Jun/70:	Tinker AFB,OK
Jun/70-Jun/71:	Viet Nam
Jun/71-Feb/73:	Tinker AFB, OK
Feb/73-May/73:	Break-in-service (Cont. Ed.)
May/73-Oct/74:	Tinker AFB, OK
Oct/74-May/77:	Kadena AB, Okinawa, Japan
May/77-Jul/77:	Recruiter Tech School, Lackland AFB, TX
Jul/77-Oct/79:	Recuiter - Salina, KS
Oct/79-Oct/81:	Recuiter Operations NCO, 3504 Rctg. Gp., Lackland AFB, TX
Oct/81-Aug/84:	Recruiting Service Liaison, Recruiting HQ., Lackland AFB, TX
Aug/84-Sep/85:	Recruiting Flight Supervisor, Aurora, CO
Sep/85-Present	Recruiting Training Supervisor, Lowry AFB, CO

BIOGRAPHICAL BACKGROUND

NAME: MARIE A. COLEMAN, Airman Basic

BIRTH PLACE & DATE: Chicago, IL 22 Dec 1962

EDUCATION:

High School - Bolling Brook, IL

Graduated - June 1981

College - Three Years

Lewis University
Romeoville, IL

WORK:

Secretary, Joliet Junior College

Price Coordinator, Cub Food Chain

Cashier, Zayre Department Store

MILITARY BACKGROUND

Enlisted: Mar 85, Juliet, IL

Active Duty: Dec 85

Career Field: Inventory Management Specialist

NEW G.I. BILL STATUS

Enrolled

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

ON

TECHNICAL SERGEANT CYNTHIA M. CRAMER

I began my military career with the South Dakota Air National Guard in February of 1979. Upon completion of basic training and technical training, I was assigned as a Medical Service Specialist and served in that capacity for two and one-half years. During this period I was selected to perform an additional duty as a member of the Socal Actions Equal Opportunity Committee. In May of 1981 I participated in my first Operational Readiness Inspection (ORI), and my unit received an overall outstanding for the exercise.

Soon after returning I requested a transfer to the Consolidated Aircraft Maintenance Squadron, and was accepted into the Weapons Control Systems Shop, WCS. I attended technical training at Lowry AFB, CO. During this time in the Avionics Branch in South Dakota, I was the only female in the Branch. In August 1984 I went to my second ORI where the unit received an overall excellent rating.

I moved to Colorado in November of 1984 after being selected as a full time technician. I participated in my third ORI with the 140 TFW in August of 1985. During this inspection I not only worked in the WCS Shop but also as the Disaster Preparedness Shelter Supervisor. In this capacity I wrote and directed implementation of the shelter plan during the nuclear exercise. The Shelter received an outstanding from the IG team. This was unique since it was the first time the shelter had actually been activated during an inspection of the Colorado Air National Guard.

In November 1985 I went to Recruiting School where I was recognized for outstanding achievement on three of my four graded exercises. My first quarter in the recruiting field I was awarded recruiter of the quarter with twenty three new recruits. In April 1986 I was promoted to the rank of TSgt.

I've been a member of the Enlisted Association my entire career and was elected the State Assistant Junior Non-Commissioned Officer Director at the 1986 convention.

My husband Russ is also a member of the Colorado Air National Guard with the 139th TCF. He works full time as an Active Guard Reserve Technician in the position of NCOIC of the Satellite Communications Shop. He is active in ANG matters and he also was elected to a Colorado Enlisted Association board position at the 1986 convention.

We live in Larkspur, CO, a small town about forty miles south west of Denver. Our hobbies include horse back riding, camping and hiking in the Colorado mountains.

BIOGRAPHICAL BACKGROUND

NAME:	Crow, Vernon K.
SSN:	523-36-5464
UNIT:	HQS COARNG, Denver, CO
DOB:	June 23, 1934
BIRTHPLACE:	Boulder, Colorado
EDUCATION:	Boulder High School, Boulder, Colorado; Pike Peak Community (AA Degree)
MILITARY HISTORY:	COARNG - 20 years

302ND TACTICAL AIRLIFT WING PUBLIC AFFAIRS OFFICE, AIR FORCE RESERVE
PETERSON AFB, CO 80914-5000 (AC 303) 554-4117

SMSGT JEANIE V. DOUGLAS

Senior Master Sergeant Jeanie V. Douglas entered the United States Air Force in October 1965. She served as a Communications Specialist at Randolph Air Force Base, TX, from 1965 to 1969. She then transferred to Clark AB, Philippines, where she was selected for special duty as the Protocol NCO for the base commander.

In 1970, after returning from the Philippines SMSgt Douglas returned to the civilian community in Albuquerque, NM, working for a local radio station. Later in 1970, she returned to the United States Air Force, this time entering the recruiting field. SMSgt Douglas performed duty as a recruiter until October 1972, when she once again separated from the Air Force to pursue her education.

SMSgt Douglas graduated from the University of New Mexico with a Bachelor of Arts Degree in Sociology in June 1976. While completing college, she became a member of the New Mexico Air National Guard and served in Personnel and Social Actions from October 1972 to September 1976. In September 1976, Sergeant Douglas entered active duty as a recruiter for the New Mexico Air National Guard serving until April 1978, when she was transferred to the Oklahoma Air National Guard. In October 1978, Sergeant Douglas began duty as an in-service recruiter for the Air Force Reserve at Kirtland AFB and Cannon AFB, NM. She distinguished herself by winning numerous national awards for her outstanding recruiting production.

During her first year in Air Force Reserve recruiting, SMSgt Douglas was awarded her first Century Club badge for recruiting in excess of 100 people in that year. She received the 200 Club badge for her recruiting efforts during her second year of recruiting.

In June 1980, SMSgt Douglas was transferred to Peterson Air Force Base, CO, as in-service recruiter for Peterson AFB and the United States Air Force Academy, CO. In 1981, she was presented the Master Recruiting badge for three consecutive years of recruiting in excess of 100 people each year. In October 1981, SMSgt Douglas was selected as Senior Recruiter for the new 901 TAG, where she is currently assigned. Since October 1981, the recruiting staff for the 901 TAG has received the Excellence Award for every quarter except one. In 1983, SMSgt Douglas was presented the Norman G. Roberts Award by 4th Air Force, an award for the Senior Recruiter who demonstrates outstanding performance under adverse circumstances.

SMSgt Douglas' military decorations include the Air Force Commendation Medal with Oak Leaf Cluster, Air Force Outstanding Unit Award with two Oak Leaf Clusters, and the Air Force Organizational Excellence Award.

She has two children; Edward and Daryl.

BIOGRAPHICAL BACKGROUND

NAME: Hand, John B.

SSN: 272-34-1521

UNIT: US Army Recruiting Bn Denver Denver, CO

DOB: March 24, 1938

BIRTHPLACE: Wellsville, Ohio

EDUCATION: Wellsville High School, Wellsville, Ohio;
Cal State Northridge, Los Angeles, CA

MILITARY HISTORY: (ACTIVE DUTY 1958 - 1961) (US ARMY RESERVE 1974- Present)

BIOGRAPHICAL BACKGROUND

NAME:	Hurd, Norm Jr.
SSN:	152-42-7174
UNIT:	US Army Recruiting Bn Denver Denver, CO
DOB:	July 17, 1952
BIRTHPLACE:	Newark, New Jersey
EDUCATION:	Newark School of Performing Arts; University of Maryland
MILITARY HISTORY:	Infantry Soldier - Drill SGT - Army Recruiter

BIOGRAPHICAL BACKGROUND

NAME: LYNETTE M. KOSKI, Airman

BIRTH PLACE & DATE: Virginia, MN, 1 Sep 1967

EDUCATION:

High School - Virginia, MN

Graduated: May 85

MILITARY BACKGROUND

Enlisted: Feb 85, Minneapolis, MN

Active Duty: 21 Aug 85

Career Field: Personnel Specialist

NEW G.I.BILL STATUS:

Not enrolled

BIOGRAPHICAL BACKGROUND

NAME: PHILIP M. NOE, SMSgt (select)

BIRTH PLACE & DATE: Peoria, IL, 24 May 1955

Education:

High School - Pekin H. S., Pekin, IL

Graduated - Jun 1973

CCAF Degree - Jul 85, Materiel Management

CCAF Degree - Dec 85, Instructor Technology

Expects to complete BS degree Oct 86

MILITARY BACKGROUND:

Enlisted: Jul 1973

Career Field: Supply Program Training Manager
(Occupational Measurement)

Sep 84 - Present	-	Lowry AFB
Sep 83 - Sep 84	-	Saudi Arabia
Aug 79 - Aug 83	-	Lowry (Instructor)
Nov 73 - Aug 79	-	Dover AFB

Old G.I. Bill participant

BIOGRAPHICAL BACKGROUND

NAME: Pollard, Wallace

SSN: 111-66-0579

UNIT: CO C 7th FS Bn Ft Carson, CO

DOB: August 7, 1967

BIRTHPLACE: Brooklyn, New York

EDUCATION: Aviation High School, New York

MILITARY HISTORY: Entered Active Duty 21 October 1985

BIOGRAPHICAL BACKGROUND

NAME:	Portman, Paul Jean Jr.
SSN:	552-92-7007
UNIT:	US Army Recruiting Bn Denver Denver, CO
DOB:	December 13, 1952
BIRTHPLACE:	Salina, Kansas
EDUCATION:	Madison High School, San Diego, CA; University of New Orleans
MILITARY HISTORY:	(1971 - Present) Recruiter since September 1979

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

ON

CHIEF MASTER SERGEANT GURNEY A. ULRICH

Chief Master Sergeant Gurney A. Ulrich assumed his current position as Senior Enlisted Advisor to the Colorado Air National Guard, in February 1984.

Chief Ulrich was born in Denver, Colorado and, for the most part, has been a resident of Englewood, Colorado with the exception of 14 years spent on active duty at various duty stations.

Chief Ulrich enlisted in Company "I" 157th Infantry Regiment, Colorado ARNG, 20 May 1947. He later transferred to the 138th AC&W SQ, Colorado ANG, in March of 1950 and served with the unit during its activation on 1 May 1951 for the Korean conflict. His assignments included tours in Wyoming, Oklahoma, Kansas, Korea, Utah, Texas, and Illinois. Chief Ulrich remained on active duty with the United States Air Force until 17 December 1962 when he returned to his home in Englewood, Colorado and re-enlisted in the Colorado ANG, 140 Tactical Fighter Wing (TFW), as an Air Technician, on 20 January 1963. Chief Ulrich has served in numerous specialties including: infantryman, airborne radio operator, communications center operations, course writer, academic instructor, ROTC instructor, security police and tactical instructor.

Chief Ulrich was recalled to active duty, 26 January 1968, with the 140 TFW in July of that year and assigned as Superintendent of Securty Police at McConnell AFB, Witchita, Kansas. He remained in that capacity until his release from active duty, 17 June 1969, when he returned to Buckley ANG Base to assume the duties of Chief of Security Police, in Air Technician status. He has remained in that position since.

Chief Ulrich has contributed many off-duty hours to the Air National Guard during his enlistment and employment as Chief of Security Police. He has assumed responsibility for protection of numerous dignitaries who have visited Buckley ANG Base and the Denver area, including presidents, vice-presidents and heads of state.

Chief Ulrich is keenly interested in military history, as well as history in general, and is a member of Concern for America's Military Past (CAMP) and the Denver Posse of the Westerners. Chief Ulrich is actively concerned with the preservation of historic sites and also serves as the Base Historian at Buckley ANG Base. Chief Ulrich also keeps current with professional organizations such as the International Association of Chiefs of Police and the American Society of Industrial Security. He has served as a member of the Denver Speakers Bureau and has given numerous speeches on military history.

Chief Ulrich's decorations include: the Outstanding Unit Award with two Oak Leaf Clusters, the Air Force Excellence Award with two Oak Leaf Clusters, the Air Force Good Conduct Medal, the Army Good Conduct Medal with three loops, the National Defense Service Medal with one Bronze Star, the Korean Service Medal with two battle stars, the Air Force Longevity Service Ribbon with a silver and two Oak Leaf Clusters, the Air Reserve Forces Meritorious Service Award with one silver Oak Leaf Cluster, the Small Arms Expert Ribbon with one device, the Republic of Korea Presidential Unit Award, and the United Nations Service Medal.

Chief Ulrich was married to the former Lucille Annette DeLia, of Chester, Pennsylvania, 10 July 1958. They have one daughter, Michelle, and a granddaughter, Adrieanna.

BIOGRAPHICAL BACKGROUND

NAME:	Wilkerson, Claude Eugene
SSN:	231-82-4092
UNIT:	HHC 1/77 Armor Ft Carson, CO
DOB:	August 28, 1953
BIRTHPLACE:	Mebane, North Carolina
EDUCATION:	Westor Branch High School Chesapeake, VA; Pike Peak Community (1 year)
MILITARY HISTORY:	Korea - 3 years/Colorado - 5 years/Alaska - 4 years

WRITTEN COMMITTEE QUESTIONS AND THEIR RESPONSE

CHAIRMAN DASCHLE TO COLORADO NATIONAL GUARD

JUN 16 1986

STATE OF COLORADO

DEPARTMENT OF MILITARY AFFAIRS
[illegible]

5 June 1986

The Honorable Thomas A. Daschle
Chairman, Subcommittee on Education, Training & Employment
U. S. House of Representatives
Committee on Veterans Affairs
335 Cannon House Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Representative Daschle:

I considered it a distinct honor to have been asked to appear at the hearing in Denver concerning the New GI Bill and H.R. 3747. Your letter, subsequent to that hearing, asks two additional questions. My answers follow:

1. Question: To be eligible for the New GI Bill, a guard member must enlist, reenlist or extend an enlistment for six years. As a Commander, what is the importance of a six-year commitment to you?

Answer: The importance of six years is twofold: 1) Given six years with an individual, he or she can be trained to the very top of a particular military skill and thus be of far greater value to the military and, in many cases, to the civilian community. 2) Our retention rates across the spectrum of the National Guard are currently not very good. Here in Colorado, we can expect to lose approximately 20%-25% of our force each year. We already have some statistical data which shows that those who participate in the GI Bill program tend to stay with us and to honor that six-year commitment. I believe that if the bill is extended or becomes permanent law, we will see our retention problems virtually "go away."

2. Question: For a member of the Guard, the full time benefit under the New GI Bill is $140 a month for 36 months, or a total of $5,040. The Subcommittee understands the cost of training a member of the Guard is considerably more. In your personal opinion, isn't the New GI Bill very cost effective?

Answer: Any program within Federal government which actually makes a profit for Uncle Sam has to be included in the definition of "cost effective." As stated in the answer to Question 1, we will be able to retain good quality people because they will be enrolled in a school of their choice, participating in the GI Bill. It currently costs between $17,000 and $25,000 to train one of our soldiers or airmen. Each time we lose one of these people, they of course must be replaced. Over the long term, a permanent GI Bill will not only "make" money but, more important, it will have an enormous effect on our combat capability because we will have been able to train and retain those good people.

I hope these answers are sufficient for your needs and I want to thank you for the tremendous effort you and other members of the Veterans Affairs Committee have expended in this endeavor. If I can be of further assistance, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

JOHN L. FRANCE
Major General, COANG
The Adjutant General

CHAIRMAN DASCHLE TO SOUTH DAKOTA NATIONAL GUARD

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA
DEPARTMENT OF MILITARY AND VETERANS AFFAIRS
OFFICE OF THE ADJUTANT GENERAL
2823 WEST MAIN STREET
RAPID CITY, SOUTH DAKOTA 57702-8186

DIVISIONS
National Guard
Emergency Disaster Services
Veterans Affairs

SDMPO

12 June 1986

JUN 19 1986

Mr. Tom Daschle
Chairman
Subcommittee on Education
Training and Employment
325 Cannon House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Mr. Chairman:

To answer the questions of your letter dated 30 May 1986, the following statements are submitted:

Q. To be eligible for the New GI Bill, a guard member must enlist, reenlist or extend an enlistment for six years. As a Commander, what is the importance of a six year commitment to you?

A. A six year commitment provides a better educated, experienced and quality soldier which creates a higher state of readiness for the National Guard. A six year enlistment also reduces turn-over of personnel which is very important in a shrinking recruiting market. In addition, a longer commitment reduces the need for basic training and advanced individual training slots at the training bases.

Q. For a member of the guard, the full-time benefit under the New GI Bill is $140 a month for 36 months, or a total of $5,040. The subcommittee understands the cost of training a member of the guard is considerably more. In your personal opinion, isn't the New GI Bill very cost effective?

A. Yes. It serves as a strong retention incentive and the education opportunities offered by this program have encouraged a higher quality individual into the Guard. I agree with your House Veterans Affairs Committee News Release of 5 February 1986, which states, "Its costs will be offset several times over by participants paying taxes on higher incomes and by reductions in bonus pay and training costs." This bill is very effective and it has to be retained.

Sincerely,

RONALD F. WILLIAMSON
MG (SD), SDARNG
The Adjutant General

Chairman Daschle to Chief Master Sergeant Ulrich

Chief Ulrich, we held a hearing recently on legislation to prohibit discrimination in hiring against members of the Guard and Reserve. I know that service in the Reserve components can be difficult because of job and family conflicts.

Will the new G.I. Bill encourage individuals to join and stay in the Guard and Reserves in spite of these conflicts?

A: Obviously this is a difficult question to answer, as once again we are atempting to look into the motivations of personnel for joining initially. If the trend back toward patriotism continues, that in itself will continue to increase motivation. If a family unit has a common goal that includes, or consists of the seeking of a degree or vocational trade and that goal is enabled by membership in the Guard/Reserve components, and the G.I. Bill which would be available as a result of said membership, perhaps some personnel would tend to overlook what they perceive as an inconvenience in the membership in the component. Obviously the G.I. Bill can do nothing but help toward retaining personnel and once again help the entire country in the process by producing a more informed and productive American. This of course would be the same rationale for a business or place of employment for the Reservist/Guardsman, as they improve themselves, they will hopefully also improve their productivity. If families/businesses can see where they will benefit from their support of the individual they will go that extra step to support.

CHAIRMAN DASCHLE TO MASTER SERGEANT NOE

QUESTION:

1. I noticed on your resume that you are using your Vietnam Era GI Bill benefits. How has the availability of these education benefits enriched your life? Has the Air Force benefited because you continued your education?

ANSWER: The availability of Vietnam Era GI Bill benefits has greatly enhanced my life. Without these benefits I could not have hoped to complete my undergraduate degree and pursue even higher educational goals at the graduate level. I feel that my attending college has increased my awareness of the world around me and has made it possible for me to expand my horizons. I would not have had this opportunity if I had not received assistance from the Vietnam Era GI Bill. I am currently applying for commission as an Air Force officer through one of the many opportunities available to enlisted members. Even if I am not accepted for commission, I feel that I would not even have had the opportunity to apply if educational assistance through the Vietnam Era GI Bill was not available.

I feel the Air Force has reaped many benefits from my obtaining an advanced education. If I had not pursued advanced educational goals, I could not have reached my current level of expertise in these 13 years that I have been a member of the United States Air Force. I have concentrated my education in the areas of management and accounting. I feel that I am better able to manage the people, money, and materials in my current career in Inventory Management. If I am selected for commission, the Air Force will reap even more benefits from my education.

QUESTION:

2. Is it important to you, and others with eligibility for the Vietnam Era GI Bill, that you may use your education benefits after December 31, 1989, because of the New GI Bill?

ANSWER:

2. Retention of a career force is very important to our national defense. With the Vietnam Era GI Bill running out at the end of 1989, many career individuals had to make a choice of remaining on active duty and losing largely unused benefits, or, leaving the service and pursuing their education. This choice for those eligible for retirement was a simple one. I know many individuals who a few years ago left the military at the minimum retirement point so that they would not lose these benefits. With the New GI Bill this choice need no longer be made. I feel the extention/transfer of Vietnam Era GI Bill benefits to the New GI Bill is a great tool for retention of career individuals beyond the 20-year point of service. Penalizing individuals for staying on active service, by eliminating their Vietnam Era GI Bill benefits is not a sound retention decision.

CHAIRMAN DASCHLE TO MASTER SERGEANT CATHEY

QUESTION:

1. Based on your experience, what has been the role of the New GI Bill in the decision-making of potential recruits?

ANSWER:

1. Quality applicants contact the Air Force for a number of reasons. The main benefit that applicants seek, however, is education and training. The stronger the education and training benefits, the more likely an applicant will decide on the US Air Force. The New GI Bill is an avenue to college education and a strong part of the total education and training package.

QUESTION:

2. Has the New GI Bill aided you in enlisting higher quality recruits?

ANSWER:

2. With competition from higher education institutions and a very competitive civilian job market for the highest quality applicant, it is vital that we, Air Force recruiters, maintain a level of competitive benefits. True, today's applicants are more patriotic in their views and more interested on our country's future. However, the final decision to enlist or not can depend to a large extent on what the Air Force can offer in return. The "New GI Bill" is a definite positive tool in the final decision-making process of our quality young people entering today's Air Force.

CHAIRMAN DASCHLE TO AIRMAN COLEMAN

QUESTION:

1. Would you recommend participation in the New GI Bill to others entering the Air Force?

ANSWER:

1. Yes, because I feel the new GI Bill gives people an opportunity to go to college who otherwise wouldn't be able to because of the expense.

QUESTION:

2. In your personal view, is the New GI Bill good for the Air Force and should it be continued?

ANSWER:

2. Yes, because anything that educates individuals would in turn make the Air Force a quality service and to me that is what the Air Force is all about, quality.